

OCTOBER 1957

Christian News-Letter

THE NEW ANGRY YOUNG MEN

Leslie Paul

CRIME AND SIN

Letitia Fairfield

YOUNG GERMANS LOOK AT LIFE

Gottfried Weber

EDITED BY JOHN LAWRENCE

Published quarterly by

THE CHRISTIAN FRONTIER COUNCIL

CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER

Editor: John Lawrence.

Assistant Editor: Mark Gibbs.

Vol. 5, No. 4

October 1957

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
FROM THE EDITOR	
<i>Christian Thinking; Frontier</i>	1
MR. POLLY GRADUATES. Leslie Paul	7
THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL STUDIES. Charles Vereker	20
CHILDREN POSE THE PROBLEMS. William Pickering	24
FRONTIER FIXTURES	28
FRONTIER CHRONICLE	29
YOUNG GERMANS LOOK AT LIFE. Gottfried Weber	32
CRIME AND SIN. Letitia Fairfield	37
ECONOMIC POWER IN ASIA. John Healey	39
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	42
BOOK REVIEWS. By D. M. Mackinnon, Ethel Upton, J. L. Mongar and E. G. Wedell	45
BOOKS RECEIVED	<i>Inside Back Cover</i>
OUR CONTRIBUTORS	<i>Inside Back Cover</i>

Subscription 10/6 per annum. Special rate for full-time students and missionaries 5/- post free. Single copies available on request 2/6 (post free 2/8).

Subscriptions to:

*Oxley & Son (Windsor) Ltd.,
4 High Street, Windsor.*

Editorial Correspondence:

*24 St. Leonard's Terrace,
London, S.W.3.*

The Christian Frontier Council, under whose auspices this journal is published, is a fellowship of 30 or 40 lay men and women who hold responsible positions in secular life and have met regularly for the past eleven years to explore with each other the practical implications of their faith. They include members of all denominations. From time to time the Council forms specialised groups to deal with subjects such as politics, medicine or education. The Council does not seek publicity, but on appropriate occasions the substance of its discussions will be made known in this journal. The Editor is solely responsible for what is published in "Christian News-Letter".

CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER

From the Editor

A dear friend has taken me to task for continually expressing what I purport to be Christian views about subjects which in my friend's view have nothing to do with Christianity. I am sure that she is wrong but the criticism would not have been made unless there was a weakness in the type of spirituality which the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER exemplifies.

It does not follow as my critic seems to expect that we ought all to have the same view about anything. What does matter is that we should all have the right concerns. I am sure that I and other writers in these pages often reach wrong conclusions, but I do not fear that, so long as we have pointed to things that really matter and have discussed them with competence. The function of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER—and next year of FRONTIER—is not so much to find solutions as to direct the attention of Christians, and of others, to things that do matter in the perspective of eternity even if they do not look like that at first sight. What we in the Christian Frontier movement are saying is that the redemption of the world means even more than past generations of Christians have thought it to mean. This generation really is gaining a new understanding of certain aspects of God's purpose for the world.

This is a gift of the Holy Spirit for which we show very little gratitude (I speak for myself). But the gift brings its special danger which is that in our enthusiasm for what is newly unfolded to us we may forget something of "that which was from the beginning". To be Pietist is not so bad as to forget piety. The Christian Frontier movement originates in profound theology but it is easy to forget that; and then the Frontier movement is in danger of turning into a new form of the social gospel", a salvation by works, which is no salvation. The Christian Frontier movement would do more harm than good if it were not set in an ordered spiritual life. Yet something has happened to the rhythm of life which is making it harder to live a spiritual life in the world. We need a new model which will do for the second half

of the twentieth century, something of what the *Imitation of Christ* did for the late Middle Ages and *The Pilgrim's Progress* did for the seventeenth century. FRONTIER means to make a humble beginning next January by trying to examine the causes which make it difficult to lead a spiritual life in the world today.

My critical friend makes another criticism which is more serious if it is true. She accuses me by implication of encouraging the tendency of Church bodies to make pronouncements on subjects which they do not understand. If the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER has been failing in this way, the editor is due to be sacked. It is a cardinal principle of the Christian Frontier Council that the first duty of Christians faced with a secular problem is to get their facts right. The CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER is lucky, perhaps uniquely so, in always having on tap excellent professional advice on any subject that is likely to crop up. The editor avails himself freely of this and is convinced that any merit that the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER has had, or that FRONTIER is likely to have, will depend mainly on the editor's skill in listening to the right people. The trouble is that the best available knowledge is never perfect knowledge. So in a sense it is quite true that an editor is always expressing and sponsoring views that are based on imperfect knowledge. But so is everyone else. What I have seen of the workings of government, both from inside and outside the machine, makes me sceptical of the claim that "only the government knows all the facts". Sometimes, of course, the government does know something which cannot be divulged but yet alters the whole picture. But I do not believe this happens as often as it is sometimes made out. And it is surprising what governments do not know. For instance, the British Government seems to have been surprised by a number of things that have happened in the Middle East in the last few years. But no one who is in touch with missionary work in this area was likely to be surprised. Indeed it would be plausible to argue that there are certain countries where the government should be always guided by the missionaries because they are almost sure to know things which the government cannot know.

But that is going too far. The task of the Church is not to displace the State but to exercise an independent judgment and to speak out when necessary. So it is a spiritual duty for the Church to be well informed about secular affairs, so that it may help Christian people and others, to act responsibly. But in practice many resolutions passed by Church bodies are neither well informed nor responsible. And that brings the Church into contempt.

Indeed, in discussing its own affairs, the Church often shows even less knowledge of facts than when it judges the State. We lament "the alienation of the working class from the Church," but we do not examine the complex structure of the working class which alone makes it possible to look realistically at the toughest problems of evangelism.

On other pages of this issue Charles Vereker examines what the social sciences could do for the Church in this country and William Pickering gives a practical illustration. The systematic study of society cannot of itself answer spiritual problems but sometimes it can show where it is likely to be most profitable to look for the answer. Even the most refined spiritual enquiries can sometimes be furthered by a little practical empiricism.

There is nothing more mysterious than the questions whether there is a real spiritual difference between men and women and, if there is a difference, what is its nature. It seems at first sight that the difference must be real if only because in practically all the Churches two women go to church for each man. The evidence which William Pickering has collected does not claim to be conclusive, but it suggests that the difference goes back to childhood, that small girls tend to be more religious than small boys and in about the same proportion. Important, true. But there is a good deal of evidence which suggests that when men have to go out to work in factories they show no more interest in religion than do men who are engaged in the same kind of work. There is a conflict of evidence on a subject of great importance. In one case it looks as if there is a fundamental spiritual difference between men and women. In the other case it looks as if the fundamental fact is that factory work discourages religion while a life centred on the home encourages it. In either case the methods of evangelism, and many other things, are greatly affected. The answer could be discovered by further research and surely it would be worth the Church paying for it. In the meantime it is good news that Mr. Pickering's researches into the attitude of school children to religion are likely to be continued.

Research is no substitute for spiritual intuition but it provides material which intuition must interpret. Suppose for the sake of argument that the greater tendency of women and girls to be religious eventually proved as an empirical fact which is not wholly dependent on a difference of occupation—and I suspect that in the end this is what will be shown. What then are we to make of it?

It used to be commonly asserted that "women are better than men". I doubt the assertion is too sweeping but it has always seemed to me

that there is a sense in which women really are better than men, the reason being that the relation of the human soul to God is feminine in one of the deeper meanings of the word.

That surely is one of the reasons why the Song of Solomon is in the Bible. Whatever the original purpose of that marvellous book it is now in the Bible by the will of God and it says things about the soul's relation to God which cannot be expressed in any other way. The allegorical interpretation of the Bible is often more to the point than many of us suppose. A woman's relation to a man is in some sense a type of the soul's relation to God. So when a woman turns to God she has something of the pattern of the experience in her life already. But when a man turns to God he has to go against the pattern of his most intimate earthly relations. Women flatter men subtly by looking up to them for decisions and emphasising their dependence on them. men accept the flattery with eagerness. Their pride and self-centredness is reinforced thereby and they are tempted to look on themselves almost as miniature Gods. After all a man's role is commonly more creative and this tempts him to set himself up against the Creator.

If this is true it ought to affect our view of Christian marriage and it might affect our whole conception of the part that women ought to play in the Church. If it is not true, it is a dangerous misconception. Sociological study of religion could not show whether it *is* true but it could show whether the idea is possible or impossible.

There are many other important things that the Churches could learn by applying the techniques of the social sciences to the facts of social and religious life. I should like to see the work done by the clergy of all grades analysed by competent sociologists. How much of it would turn out to be an integral part of the pastoral office and how much could be delegated to chosen members of the laity?

In Britain the pastoral relation of the clergy to their people is unsatisfactory in most if not in all churches. How far is this the result of the clergy not knowing the social background of their flock? How far is it the fault of the Church for leaving its organisation unchanged when congregations change? How many Churches have congregations gathered from a distance with no relation to a neighbourhood or to each other? It puts the clergy into an impossible situation to expect them somehow to weld into a community a scratch collection of people whose sins and virtues they do not always know and who by definition never could become a community.

When people are rehoused it ought to be one of the first concerns of the local Churches to see that the relation of kinship and commun-

cherished. Ethel Upton's review of *Family and Kinship in East London* on another page shows something of what can happen when planners forget humanity and the Churches forget that Christian concern for the family is not an abstraction but something that may be intimately affected by the time spent in journeys and the cost of buckets.

A great deal of work has been done by social scientists on human subjects such as the limits of size which any group of people must observe if it is to keep its human coherence, and the question how many subordinates can one man keep in effective touch with? The results of such study cannot be applied automatically to industry or public administration but they do provide a touchstone for deciding whether a particular form of organisation has a chance of becoming a real human community. And that goes for the Church too. Indeed the Church ought to be the prototype of all human community. If it fails that is partly because it will not listen to some of the things that the secular study of society has discovered about the ordering of human life. The study of human relations is a branch of the whole study of the created order which is one of the means by which we learn God's will for the world that He loves. It is idle for the episcopal Churches to talk of a Bishop as a father in God if dioceses are so large that the father has more children than he can hope to know really well. Unenlightened industrial managers would not make that mistake. It would be nice to think that the non-episcopal Churches have an organisation which pays more regard to elementary human factors. But have they?

The answers to such questions cannot be discovered without study. FRONTIER will return to this theme.

“Frontier”

I do not say goodbye to the readers of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, but I would like to thank them for their steady support over the last few years. As I see the subscription renewals every quarter I am continually surprised that so few readers fail to renew their subscriptions. The words of appreciation (or advice) which many add to their renewal forms help greatly to keep readers and editors in touch. These are the last words that I shall write as editor of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, and I now look forward to an editorship of *Frontier*, which will be both a continuation of old friendships and a chance to widen the field of editorial interest.

Frontier will continue to pursue the traditional concerns of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER and will also publish in each number articles about the Church in "Frontier" situations overseas, in countries such as Ghana, Brazil and Indonesia, to mention only those which we hope to write about in the near future. I am finding it a task of absorbing interest to learn of the life and the problems of Christians in so many other countries. We intend to publish a number of articles on the Christian approach to the great religions of the East, now in militant resurgence. We mean to invite a number of contributions on the difficulties and opportunities of making a busy twentieth-century life into a life of prayer. And we hope to develop a new approach to the problems of nuclear warfare. Rear-Admiral Sir Anthony Buzzard is preparing an article on this subject for the first number of *Frontier*. With ampler resources *Frontier* hopes to give its readers better service than the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER has been able to give.

J. W. L.

Frontier

The first number of *Frontier*, which will take the place of CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER and of *World Dominion*, appears in January, and the occasion will be marked by a Frontier Luncheon at the Royal Empire Society, Northumberland Avenue, W.C.1, at 12.45 on 14th January, 1958.

Sir Kenneth Grubb, chairman of *Frontier's* Board of Management, will take the chair, and John Lawrence, who is to be editor of *Frontier*, will speak on "The Opportunities of Christians in the Welfare State" and will outline future plans for *Frontier*.

Frontier will appear quarterly. It will contain more pages than the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER but will cost slightly less (10s. per annum normal rate; half rate for students, missionaries and retired clergy). Subscriptions to the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER are being credited automatically to *Frontier* unless otherwise requested.

Mollie Hicks, at present associate editor of *World Dominion*, now becomes associate editor of *Frontier*, and Mark Gibbs becomes News Editor; he will be particularly concerned with building up an expanded Frontier Chronicle, as well as forming a member of the editorial team.

"Angry Young Man", Leslie Paul's autobiography of "the strenuous interwar years", set a literary fashion. He now returns to his old subject in a study of the current generation of "angry young men". Other autobiographical works of his are "The Living Hedge" and "The Boy Down Kitchener Street". A new philosophical study by him, "Nature into History", is to be published this month.

Mr. Polly Graduates

or the Tragical Comedy of the New Angry Young Men

LESLIE PAUL

Of course you know Mr. Polly. If he had been born in the thirties think we should have got him through his G.C.E. Spelling and pronunciation would have been a problem, of course ("It's his parents, old chap—have you seen them?") but he enjoyed "cheerful phases of enterprise" and discovered "reading and its joys" on his own and would sneak out on moonlight nights and stare up at the stars, and afterwards find it difficult to tell his father where he had been". In fact, remembering all that cocky youthful brightness of his, I think he should have managed to rob the drapery business of his services and got him a state scholarship to a red-brick university. His little legacy would have helped him, though we might have advised him to leave it in case he needed it to buy a sweet stall. Some military service towards the end of the war and the beginning of peace would have toughened and broadened him, brightened his eye, and made him more attractive to women. He would have gained enough worldly wisdom about love and sex to save him that disastrous marriage he contracted. He would have learnt how to take a moderate amount of beer without getting tipsy. But I don't think Mr. Polly would have married Miriam and gone to live in a little shop with a cat and a parrot. No. His eyes would have been opened to the fact that you no longer have to marry or even to love a woman to sleep with her: anyway he would have wanted to "get on" intellectually, for we have reckoned with that other side of Polly which he could never in his nurture except by threepenny volumes chosen at random from boxes of books outside secondhand furniture shops. "Words attracted him curiously, words rich in suggestion, and he loved a novel and

striking phrase"—but the class problem raises its head—"he avoided every recognised phrase in the language"—a gift which he bequeathed to some modern poets—"and mispronounced everything in order that he shouldn't be suspected of ignorance but whim". He was full of Eloquent Rapsodooce and Cultured Rapacacity and intoxicated with his own Sesquippedalan verbojuice. You have guessed it. His fate to-day would be nothing less than a lectureship in English at a minor university.

Would his life have been any happier? I doubt it. You remember that his primary education was described by Wells as leaving his mind "in much the same state that you would be in, dear reader, if you were operated on for appendicitis by a well-meaning, boldly enterprising but rather overworked and underpaid butcher boy, who was superseded towards the climax of the operation by a left-handed clerk of high principles but intemperate habits". The culture which shone so rosily for Polly while it stayed at a romantic distance, close to would have looked very much like that, only more so. Junior Lecturer Polly would have had doubts. He would suffer feelings of inferiority and uselessness. He would not know what scholasticism was. He would either resent or despise those parts of culture which did not attract him. Flutes and recorders and Dowland would annoy him. "Filthy Mozart", he would mutter under his breath. But his revolution would be timid, ill-timed and absurd, and the more I develop the engaging theme the more obvious it is that Mr. Polly succeeded in getting his Junior Lectureship and that *Lucky Jim* by Kingsley Amis chronicles his subsequent history.

Jim sets fire to the bedclothes, Polly to his shop. Polly fights the stuttering Rusper amid the ironmongery, Lucky Jim fights Bertrand about a girl. Lucky Jim flies off in haste after his drunken lecture and subsequent sack to salvation at the hands of a millionaire with the name of Gore-Urquhart, Polly yearns into the bosom of the landlord of the Potwell Inn, having just as valiantly defeated the troubler of the world as Jim defeated Bertrand.

Both, both, are bored, *BORED!*

And they are both running away to improbable worlds. Potwell Inn is an Eden which has drowned its serpent, and the millionaire boy Lucky Jim is going to work for comes from the glossy magazines and is the only character in the book who is neither comic nor contemptible.

On one occasion in Mr. Polly's young life he was the victim of romantic love for a young person not of his class: a fate more common now that we all meet in the same London Transport bus. He suffered

badly. His love was a schoolgirl who climbed the wall of her school grounds and sat there worshipful in her short blue linen frock and allowed herself to be wooed by the lower middle class Galahad on a bicycle. The liaison ended abruptly in humiliation and Polly turned to Miriam. This was the only occasion in Polly's life when he was a fish out of water in the *class* sense. For the rest he fitted his environment like a hand a glove. He belonged to the world of Bottom. It was in a human, not a class sense, that he was a misfit. And here, I suppose, is the root difference between Mr. Polly and Lucky Jim, that Lucky Jim is a permanent misfit in the class-cultural sense and it is this which makes him so much like Mr. Polly elevated and representative of our times which has been graduating lower-class talent as Mr. Polly would say, "on the wholesale".

A New Movement

Quite a considerable literature has grown up since Kingsley Amis wrote his best-selling novel about the class-cultural misfit. It has enough in common to have acquired already the characteristics of a movement. Indeed, "The Movement" is something to which Mr. Amis himself belongs, which has in a sort of way issued a poetic manifesto in the anthology called *New Lines* published last year which more than once in the introduction by Robert Conquest strikes a *Lucky Jim* note. "Empirical in its attitude to all that comes", it is possessed of "a negative determination to avoid bad principles" while at the same time submitting "to no great systems of theoretical constructs" which might presumably work out what the bad principles were—this hits off Lucky Jim intellectually pretty well, I think.

If this mood is truly representative of the new intellectual climate we are probably going to have to endure a lot of literature about young men who are unhappy because they have been encouraged and enabled to get on, whereas in pre-war days the unhappiness was all the other way round. How wicked society was for not giving us a chance!

One of the most remarkable documents of just this movement out of one class into another is *Time and Place*, an autobiography by George Scott, who is the able young editor of *Truth*. Scott was born in Middlesbrough where his father, still living, worked as an insurance agent. He came up through provincial journalism, the war, and a scholarship to Oxford to be one of Beaverbrook's bright boys. He is, and sees himself as, one of the sons of the social revolution of our time. "But now we are there, as someone remarked in other circumstances, where are we? Either we are classless, cut off from our roots, but not

yet integrated into new environments, or else we are considered members of that vast and amorphous middle class. And it is as the latter that our fortune is most dubious. The talent in us which has been nourished and developed with such paternal care and public expense is impeded in its efforts to find its full expression by all manner of obstacles and regulations." George Scott makes this indictment visual by painting as near as comes to a comic picture of himself writing his book on top of the washing machine in the kitchen where the damp nappies clout his head and the Ideal boiler gives off sickening fumes "A man and wife, their two children, plus two visiting relations, in a three-roomed flat will not go." "The mortgage slowly and respectfully strangles the life, the love and the talent out of us."

Obviously then, the inheritors of the social revolution find it politically disappointing as well as socially confusing and culturally barren. And the same maddening inconsistency which sends Lucky Jim to seek consolation in that world of high finance which Mr. Amis' socialism strongly disapproves, causes Mr. Scott to desert his youthful political allegiance. "Whether they know it or not, and I fancy they do not, the revolutionaries have bred a generation of counter-revolutionaries."

Mr. Lambton's Credo

Lucky Polly and Mr. Jim—they are identical twins really—are quite nice if bad-mannered fellows with a turn for clownish activities like tearing their trousers on ceremonial occasions. You would not dislike them in the saloon bar of the local. But suppose that you move over from Mr. Polly and promote Uriah Heep? Supposing what comes up in the way of new climbers out of class are the "cad" and the creeper and the man who is liable to get himself in the murder columns of the *News of the World*? These types are also the heroes of the new fiction and the new plays. In John Braine's first novel, *Room at the Top*, the hero comes out of a grim industrial town which could have been Middlesbrough into a pleasant wealthy place called Warley and which might by comparison be York or Cheltenham. Joe Lambton is of working-class stock. He is not out of university, but has risen so far through grammar school and local government. Joe Lambton confesses the fierceness of his longing for wealth. "I wanted an Aston Martin, I wanted a three-guinea linen shirt, I wanted a girl with a Riviera suntan—these were my rights, I felt, a signed and sealed legacy." Even purity was a matter of the right amount of money. The Brylcreemed Lens and Sids and Rons of the world would never have the

chance of exploring in a woman "the passion and innocence which a hundred thousand in the bank could alone make possible". He goes after Susan, the daughter of the town's rich man and wins her. He gloats about this to himself, "I've got her. I took my friend's advice, she's mine and I can do what I like with her. I've beaten that bastard Wales. I'll marry her if I have to put her in the family way to do it. I'll make her daddy give me a damned good job".

This is the credo by which Joe Lambton lives and succeeds. He does put Susan in the family way, he does compel the father to take him into the business. He levers himself out of the small change of local government into the big money. Except in sex, Susan is as naive and unsophisticated as David Copperfield's child-wife. But where David's Dora had to die that David might come to happiness in marriage with the sterling Agnes, Joe Lambton wins his child-wife at the cost of driving his great-natured mistress, Alice, to suicide. Even John Braine, the author, cannot bear his creature Joe as thus exposed, all greed and calculating lust. He uses a time device to tell the story and make it more palatable. An older and disillusioned Joe Lambton looks back nostalgically on the kind of man he was before he chose to kill and climb. We are given peeps at his grand old father and loving mother in a working class home before the death of his family in an "incident" in the war. And Joe himself is allowed a chapter of melodramatic and out-of-character remorse and suicidal thoughts after the report of Alice's suicide is brought to him. These soften and make more acceptable the picture of the "cad" climbing to power and money by the exploitation of women. The history of fiction is full of such cads. What is a little remarkable about Joe is that he is the hero of *Room at the Top*, and a hero without quotation marks.

The hero of John Wain's *Living in the Present* is by contrast a life-failure. Edgar Banks is a tortured neurotic who determines in the first chapter to commit suicide but wishes to take down into the grave with him the greatest villain he can find. He achieves a wan humour at the end of chapter one: "Edgar wrote: '1. Kill Philipson-Smith. 2. Kill self.' He paused, his brow creased with thought, then added, 3. Remember stop milk'." Inwardly Edgar was "a raw mass of apology and insecurity". His nerves screamed all the time. He could not really stand up for himself in any situation. Schoolmastering was oathsome, London hateful, rural life a living death. He had a queasy spite against the whole world, obvious enough in his decision not to die alone, but to take someone positively evil with him and so make his death serve more purpose than his life. This decision drives him

to leave his teaching job and set out upon a mission to rid the world of one Philipson-Smith, an oafish, clumsy bully with a music-hall Fascist movement behind him. The picaresque adventures of one who was trying without success to remove someone else ought to be comic.

But a comic does not argue with the world. He ceases to be funny once he tries. Our sympathy begins to turn in Philipson-Smith's favour. Why should be he plagued with this self-pitying pest who has no more claim upon our sympathy than the ostensible villain—less, in fact, for we do not learn that *he* wants to murder anyone. The choice of victim is interesting all the same. For the Fascist is the last villain the modern young lefty can be sure of. Before the war there was a pretty wide choice of them—Conservative politicians, right-wing trade union leaders, imperialists, press magnates, Georgian poets, priests, heavy fathers, commissars and Texan oil kings. But can we be sure any longer that they are villains? Best to play safe and depend on the Fascists who are mostly dead or underground and have no intellectual defenders left. Even the millionaires have let us down. Remember Gore-Urquhart?

Spite and Petulance

The most abhorrent of the new angry young men is without doubt Jimmy Porter in John Osborne's play *Look Back in Anger*. Jimmy is the owner of the famous sweet stall to which the calamity of graduate status has reduced him. He married above him—Alison, a Colonel's daughter, a girl of class. Alison explains: "Well, after Jimmy and I were married, we'd no money—about eight pounds ten in actual fact—and no home. He didn't have a job. He'd only left the university about a year. (*Smiles.*) No—left. I don't think one 'comes down' from Jimmy's university. According to him, it's not even red brick, but white tile. Anyway, we went off to live in Hugh's flat. It was over a warehouse in Poplar . . . I couldn't believe that two people, two educated people could be so savage, and so—so uncompromising. Mum has always said that Jimmy is utterly ruthless, but she hasn't met Hugh. He takes the first prize for ruthlessness—from all comers. Together they were frightening. They both came to regard me as a sort of hostage from those sections of society they had declared war on".

The war declared on upper society had no point to it however, as far as the play reveals it. Beyond breaking up a few political meetings of Alison's friends—more personal spite than politics—the class war was nothing more than gate-crashing into expensive parties and insulting the long-suffering hosts. It was gutless. To anyone with experience

of genuine revolutionary movements all this spite and petulance posing as militant socialism is nauseating. The excuses for the particular shape taken by Jimmy Porter's "revolt" are thin. "I suppose people of our generation aren't able to die for good causes any longer. We had all that done for us, in the thirties and forties, when we were still kids . . . There aren't any good, brave causes left. If the big bang does come, and we all get killed off, it won't be in aid of the old-fashioned, grand design. It'll be just for the Brave New-nothing-very-much-thank-you".

In truth, Jimmy Porter's politics are no more than a queasy neurosis—a killing with the mouth. He is another Edgar Banks, except that he talks big out loud. And like that spineless worthy he plans a murder: this time it is a spiritual one. So this is no comic, picaresque desperado affair in the Alps but the clawing-down of his wife Alison. Through the unending torrent of clever abuse and maudlin self-pity and nagging complaint, in which he is the only one who is never in the wrong, he destroys her. Told by his wife's friend, Helena, after his wife had left him that Alison was going to have a baby, he replies, "Did you honestly expect me to go soggy at the knees, and collapse with remorse . . . I don't care if she's going to have a baby. I don't care if it has two heads". He then, with a quick adjustment, accepts his wife's friend as his mistress. But the end is not yet. Alison's baby dies, Alison returns, the mistress-friend Helena, moved to decency, leaves husband and wife to be reconciled.

It is not simply conventional reconciliation. It is the return of one utterly destroyed to her destroyer. Porter has succeeded in breaking Alison down to his level. He married for class revenge, and his revenge comes at last when she cries out to him that she too wants to be a lost cause: "I want to be corrupt and futile . . . Don't you see! I'm in the mud at last! I'm grovelling! I'm crawling! Oh, God—" And she collapses, as lost and damned as he is. Porter then has a moment of Dostoevskian remorse, but he has got her where he wanted her to be—ready to lick his boots. That scene is the most dreadful and moving of any play of our times.

Just as John Braine softens Joe Lambton for us by revelation of his past family life and present regret, so John Osborne softens the portrait of the Jimmy Porter he has created by revelations of his kindness to an old woman and the grief of a ten-year-old Jimmy at his sick father's death from wounds acquired in the Spanish Civil War. But Jimmy's softening, like Joe's, is directed to the audience: it has nothing essentially to do with Jimmy on the stage and living in a

present of his own creation. It is said that if sublimate is sprinkled on ants, the pain they suffer will cause them to strike out blindly at their kith and kin. In the end the nest is destroyed by this wantonness. This is Jimmy's fate: he wants to infect others with his suffering and by destroying them to escape from the pain of being alive.

We have to admit that in a literary sense these neurotic young heroes are a remarkable phenomenon in the tenth year of the Welfare State. George Scott, who is one of the same generation as Osborne and Amis and Wain, is pretty rude about the nihilism and the very odd millionaire worship of the Movement's heroes who "are forever running away from some largely imaginary mess, seeking escape in the *graffiti* of their private thoughts". He is equally scornful of a poverty of invention which leads these novelists and playwrights to depend on society nymphomaniacs to satisfy the lust for domination the heroes display. And he does not feel that these querulous pieces of writing offer any more comparison with the great days of the novel, with Dostoevsky and Tolstoy and Henry James, than children's pictures with great masters.

However, it is true that children's pictures tell us more about their authors than the works of great masters do. The masters know how to use art to conceal. With children all must come out. And if these authors are indeed the terrible children of our times, we may expect to find that they are even anxious that nothing should remain inside which when let out could possibly wound or shock. The anxiety to spit in the eye of the bourgeoisie is undoubtedly there. It would be naive all the same to assume that what Osborne or Amis or Wain create as characters, at the same time they are, or want to be, or socially approve. We don't really expect to find Dickens in Uriah Heep or Wells in Mr. Polly. That goes without saying. And to write about what one loathes is one way of curing oneself of the temptation to become it.

Yet what authors *select* to write about is always revealing and what we can say is that young authors are more apt to be autobiographical and compensatory in their novels and plays, they are more prone to take sides, and consciously or unconsciously to identify themselves with their characters, and even to rig the deck against characters they dislike, as Amis rigs the portrait of Lucky Jim's professor (funny though it undoubtedly is) so that we are never allowed to see his world from the inside, and equally simplifies the character of the millionaire Gore-Urquhart in his favour in order to justify him: we see him without the doubts and complexities which must belong to his situation.

Wain caricatures Philipson-Smith solely in order to show the murderous intentions of Edgar Banks in a good light. These (like the "softenings" to which Braine and Osborne lend themselves) are the marks not only of immaturity, but of a polemical intention which can destroy their art, for it is a kind of falsification, and like propaganda in art must stand in the way of truth and compassion proper to a creative writer's job.

However, the fact that they do take sides and do identify themselves makes all this material extremely valuable as sociology however critical one may be of it as art. And so without fear we can ask what, socially, is the burden of all this literary rage?

Question of Status

At first examination, the anger disquiets one with its pointlessness. Jimmy Porter's somewhat unreal poverty appears more like a literary device to excuse him his evil heart than the real thing socialists fought in the thirties.

Neither Joe Lambton nor Edgar Banks could complain of poverty: they were both quietly settled in good pensionable jobs from which the sack would have been unusual. Lucky Jim was a fish out of water intellectually and had the sense to admit it, but even after the sack and before the millionaire's miracle no reader could have been disturbed about his future in an economic sense. Jim might have been disappointed in his ambitions, but there was no prospect of dole queues, means test, or the hopelessness of the unemployment of the thirties. Lucky Jim would soon have learnt how to swim. He had his buttons on.

The more important source of self-pity is a kind of class despair. It looms very largely in the talk and calculations of most of these unpleasant young heroes. They are obsessed with their class inadequacy: the Brylcreem of lower middle class youth is still well rubbed into their scalps. They wear the wrong shirts, or ties, and mix up their eating irons. They have a sense of inferiority about all this only to be assuaged by climbing to millionairedom and then humiliating the people who once humiliated them. And this nourishment of their egotism is not to be brushed aside. That they are so conscious of their ion-U status and rush to encounter Nancy Mitford to find out all about it is remarkably interesting. For it is the sign of the GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT. The Welfare State, with its first-aid posts for the economically hard hit, and its broad educational ladder was going to end All That Class Business, especially in education, Once and For All. Jack was going to be as good as his master. And Jack now gets

all the right certificates to prove it, and can get any job, tutorial, professorial or industrial for which his certificates and articles in the learned journals will entitle him. Then why is he not happy at last to have lifted himself out of his h-dropping class to the one his intelligence should admit him to? Because of course he makes the discovery which George Scott so candidly confesses to—that to de-class at one level is not automatically to re-class at another—but to become uprooted. Class has such pejorative associations that we forget that it has good ones. Read Richard Hoggart's *Uses of Literacy* and I defy you not to mourn that solid and homely and family-centred working class life with its rich sense of neighbourhood which is giving way to the candy-floss world of cheap mass culture. Is it so much again to leave that world for the bed-sitter in Cromwell Road and a lectureship at a training college or London university—do the intellectual gains outweigh the human losses?

Or look at the upper class, socially speaking (for it can no longer be called that economically). It has been the fashion for a long time to despise its equestrian pursuits and its Blimpish political standards. But that is simply a caricature. In that class certain lovely things are ancient and deep-rooted—standards of architecture, of home-making, of manners, of leisure, of gardens, of service to society which comes as a matter of tradition—in that class we take for granted many of the qualities which make civilisation worth having. Unless the Welfare State leads up towards some such graciousness then we are in for a more crass and morose and materialist society than ever, God help us.

Our ferociously unhappy young men—sons of the revolution!—belong to the generation which thought that money would do it all. I don't mean *their* money—neither they nor their parents had any. I mean state money. State money was to provide them with the means to climb. It was all that they personally lacked, they were quite sure. It did not occur to them that any contribution was required from them, except brains. And climb they did, and they have arrived at a country, and find it a desert, and now bawl at us all because it is not the promised land.

What this points to is the barrenness of mere devices for getting educated and getting on. In themselves the devices are merely neutral. Only an over-riding philosophy of life gives them point. And it is the lack of this in the fifties which reduces the Edgars and Jims and Joes to nausea and despair. George Scott recognises that society is infinitely more complicated than most reformers imagined. "We, the beneficiaries of the reformers, are at least capable of understanding that society

is a complex, delicate structure, evolved through many centuries of trial and error, in which each brick has its special purpose. That purpose may well appear obscure or undesirable to a later age, but it is a precarious undertaking to remove the individual bricks before one has others to replace them and to maintain the stability of the construction . . . Is it possible that the attacks on organized religion will be seen to have been misdirected?"

Certainly the new heroes have no religion. They hardly mention it, even to attack it. It is clear that they have no faith except an anxiety to avoid "bad principles" (one must not be anti-semitic, or snobbish). There are no standards to be adhered to in sex. Love is simply a permanent sexual liaison, sex is the casual one. That is the only possible way to distinguish between them. One is not needlessly cruel or offensive to other people, but a sufficient emotional load of self-pity permits even that. Above all one does not display a jejune enthusiasm about anything, even about sex. Not to be committed is the most important thing of all, because there is simply nothing honest or true or good enough to be committed to left in the world. The wise and the wide equally stand apart and grin derisively at those who preach standards or promote movements. Not to be committed is the best for man.

Speaking for Society?

But don't let us foist this mood upon the popular new heroes of fiction. It is not their invention. They speak for society. And that is why it is no accident that they have captured the imagination of the public. To reject or avoid commitment is a disease which runs through English society like rust in wheat. The philosophers, on the whole, will not be committed to anything but sceptical analysis. Political parties no longer appear to stand for any beliefs of much consequence. The Teddy boys will not commit themselves to belief in the sanctions of society. They are all outsiders. There are the polite outsiders, the literary outsiders, the ugly outsiders. I am tempted to make the parody that we are all outsiders now. No one wants to be an insider. But no great civilisation or culture maintains itself on negatives and rejections any more than a great nation maintains itself on retreats and surrenders.

In my own mind there is no doubt that the success of Colin Wilson's *The Outsider* comes very much from the title, which seems to touch off some spring in all of us—"Of course," we said, "that's exactly what I am, and only I know what I've suffered because of it, and I'd better have a look at the book and see what I am."

The Outsider, Colin Wilson declares, is the anonymous Man Outside. "He is the hole-in-corner man." The Outsider is no longer happy inside, in the cosy pretence that all is right. He is looking in on the world. He is not a genius, necessarily, but he sees deeper. "He cannot live in the comfortable, insulated world of the bourgeois, accepting what he sees and touches as reality." Wilson quotes Keats—"I feel as if I had died already and am now living a posthumous existence." Exactly the Jimmy Porter theme. "Again, what we are witnessing is the Outsider, with his intenser and deeper insight, feeling a Jansenist disgust with mankind." "The Outsider's problem is to balance [the feeling of joy] against Van Gogh's last words: Misery will never end. It is a question no longer of philosophy but of religion." So far so good, but Colin Wilson also says that "our findings point more and more to the conclusion that the Outsider is *not* a freak, but is only more sensitive than the 'sanguine and healthy-minded' type of man." Also that "the Outsider's chief desire is *to cease to be an Outsider*. He cannot cease to be an Outsider simply to become an ordinary bourgeois; that would be a way back, 'back into the wolf or the child', and . . . this way is impracticable, is no true solution of the Outsider's problems. His problem is therefore *how to go forward*."

Portrait of an Age

Truthfully, in all this, the Outsider-Insider device becomes cumbersome, and heavily didactic. The few definitions quoted reveal an almost infinite application of the term. However, the heroes of the Colin Wilson story are such men as Wells, Lawrence, Van Gogh, Nijinsky, Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, Kierkegaard, Blake, Sartre, Hesse, Kafka. Not simply rather more sensitive ordinary men, but men of genius who, whether they failed or succeeded, raised the universal problems of men to incandescence by their spiritual fire. So that in truth Colin Wilson is exploring the spiritual genius of our age, not simply the contemporary sickness, and in that journey the term Outsider is a tiny clanking at his tail. He must have regretted by the end that he had erected an undergraduate *bon mot* to the level of a universal judgment. The truth is that outside is where the outsider ought to be. And *outside* is where the spirit calls man. From the very beginning of his earthly journey it has been tearing him from his domestic cocoon, his false and cloying allegiances, and thrusting him upon journeys and self-explorations which bring anguish and dread to him. It is worse than useless to assume that such sufferings belong only to a special sort of genius. They belong also to the humble and

illiterate, as much to Pip and Oliver Twist as to Hamlet and Raskolnikov, as much to the Woman of Samaria as to St. Theresa. The difference between genius and common humanity is that it often needs disaster—death, birth, illness, parting—to tear more ordinary folk from their contentment or resignation with the world into the realm where they both suffer and grow. Genius tends to live there most of the time, suspended between mystery and death. The answer is not to seek to bring the Outsider inside, but the insider Outside. So put, the term Outsider is robbed of the false pathos and self-pity with which Mr. Colin Wilson invests it. Outside is where we ought all to be, seeking as fully as lies in our power to live in the dimension of the spiritual.

A Religious Problem

In one sense, Colin Wilson is right: the problem for our time is *how to go forward*: and that is a religious problem. And the burden of suffering of the young heroes is that they are in the middle of the dark wood, shouting for help. It is as difficult and perilous to go back as to go forward, but they are full of negative determinations and will feel safer with nurse (for fear of meeting something worse). Neither art nor social life in the West can go forward to anything but the most mass-produced and desiccated civilisation without a new impulse of the spirit. However, it just can't be avoided, unpalatable as it is to most of our contemporaries, spiritual impulses *are* religious impulses. No matter how formulated, they demand some kind of faith, even if only faith in the basic rightness of life and willingness to accept its torments for the sake of its illuminations of the Godhead. And we can't handle even these without theoretical constructs or experience them without mystical compulsions. To accept all this is to give oneself to spirit and to sink or swim with ten thousand fathoms underneath one, or to turn from that challenge, in sullenness or rage, to the mean and trivial. To give is to commit oneself, and that is the one thing our age will not do. It wants to receive and have, like a spoilt child that always wants its way. And so, in a frenzy of tears and despair at a life which it is making meaningless, it cowers in the dark bedroom flailing at the pillows with its fists and bawling for mum.

Christian Frontier Council

The address of the Christian Frontier Council is 59 Bryanston Street, Marble Arch, London, W.1.

The Church and Social Studies

CHARLES VEREKER

“Christian ‘Sociology’ in this country is under the weather.” This homely phrase is from a paper on “Faith and Society” in the Archbishop of York’s *Durham Essays and Addresses* published last year. It is quoted here only to draw attention to the confusion which tends to beset any discussion of what is loosely described as religious sociology or the sociology of religion. The Archbishop was considering the bearing of the Christian faith, and the influence of those who hold it, on the conduct of a society no longer simply to be defined as Christian. This is a very proper subject of enquiry. But it is distinct investigations of ecclesiastical phenomena which use modern sociological techniques and from similar enquiries into those aspects of secular existence which concern the life of the Church.

The full integration of the life and teaching of the Church with modern social analysis needs both approaches. The study of society cannot ignore the presence of a unique religious institution still operating in social life. The Church, however paramount its heavenly calling, must, true to its incarnational inspiration, seek to mould the lump within which it is embedded.

From time to time there are studies embodying the Christian view of social change and the impact of modern developments on the church as an institution. They are apt, however, to be spasmodic and unprofessional, like unskilled sorties from a beleaguered fortress into a hostile countryside. The case for serious investigation of those social conditions which particularly concern the church is thus a strong one and must be pressed. Such enquiries will require thorough planning, sound strategy and a clear sense of direction.

The trend towards centralisation has been slower in ecclesiastical than in civil administration. This may be due in part to the concern of the Christian communion with personal relations but also to the survival of an institutional structure in diocese and parish framed to suit the pre-industrial era. Whether this is a good or bad phenomenon has yet to be investigated. But the congregations of the churches in England, and their potential converts outside the Christian communion, have been subjected to the manifold social influences which have transformed the British Isles during the last century and a half. The

conservatism of the Church as an institution and the local concerns of its clergy constantly cloud a full awareness of the impact of these changes; and even when particular incumbents are brought face to face with conditions, say, in a new housing estate or in a slum not yet cleared but long removed from coherent social living, the response to these challenges, spirited, brave, vigorous and imaginative as they often are, are made on so narrow a front and with so few resources that they make little headway.

These efforts in a rapidly developing social setting, show the importance of fuller study of those problems which are found to be particularly pressing for the life of the parishes and the administration of dioceses. Most university departments of social studies at some time have been visited by discouraged incumbents seeking trained help to deal with some peculiarly intractable parish, either too new and unintegrated or too soon old and disintegrated. The work involved in even a modest social study is nearly always too much to be undertaken on every casual occasion. The answer would seem to lie in building up a central fund of knowledge based on careful research which would be generally available to those who need it.

If, then, a good case can be made for more adequate investigations into ecclesiastical problems, it can be strengthened when we consider how often modern social changes are either ignored or simply not understood. The conventional defence of the parochial system often assumes that the structure and life of the average urban parish bore serious comparison with the traditional rural parish which is, perhaps unconsciously, the accepted archetype. One vicar wrote in a parish magazine: "The real glory of our parish churches is that in each place or neighbourhood they are the spiritual heart of the community". If the concept of place or neighbourhood in modern urban conditions and the spiritual aspect of community life could be redefined in modern terms, this statement might convey at any rate an ideal. But when it is expressed as a description of current facts, it must have been outdated for a long while except in the deep country; and even the stable structure of village life is seriously threatened in many districts. Men who preach an eternal gospel may well be inclined to assume a similar abiding quality in its setting, despite all the evidence to the contrary.

The new Archbishop of Cape Town's exciting study, *The Parish in Action*, shows that it is possible to see the modern parish as an entity to be created rather than a survival to be preserved. This is extremely encouraging. The author insisted that the main argument of his book was in support of the local church. But he took into account many

of those factors of modern urban existence which tend to destroy the traditional parochial structure, and he drew the conclusion in regard to the vexed question of parochial social activities that "if the Victorian pattern of church organisations is not needed today, and if such organisations as are required can be run centrally—that is, at the centre of the larger parish—then the local house of God can be planned quite differently from the past and, incidentally, far more economically."

It must be rare, however, for the parochial clergy to have either the time or the resources to conduct experimental investigations of this kind for themselves. Moreover, it is neither strictly necessary nor economical to acquire new knowledge in this manner. We are reminded of the suicidal sorties during the last war to discover the facts about some bridge, say, in northern France before it was realised that detailed illustrations of the landmark in question could be found at no risk to life or limb in the British Museum. The parallel must not be unduly pressed. But the popular weekly which recently chided an enterprising young priest for going to work in a bicycle factory was not far wrong when it remarked that "You don't have to be a sinner to understand sinners". There is a great deal of information already published about the conditions of life in factories and the opinions of the workers without each of us having to go and find out for himself.

Unfortunately, the studies of church life which are best known to the public are those sponsored by the popular Press. Inadequate statistical material is superficially presented in such a way as to draw attention to questions believed to have widespread appeal, such as the rules concerning divorce; or to subjects which are made to have an artificial catch-phrase interest, for instance, the contention that the social structure of an Anglican congregation betrays snobbishness on the part of the Established Church. Allegations of this kind are inaccurate, harmful and beside the point. They introduce into the discussion an element of spurious democratic freedom of opinion on matters which a religious communion does not normally settle in terms of votes; they inflate unreal or unimportant problems and fail to ask the pressing and vital questions. Bad or indifferent or irrelevant enquiries must be countered with good research.

Some serious studies are being undertaken; and a recent conference held at the University of Sheffield did something to pool the information already collected and to introduce to one another some of those engaged on investigations into religious aspects of social life and social aspects of religious life. In America, as might be expected, many interesting and valuable studies have been made. The writings of

Father Joseph Fichter, S.J., are already widely known in this country. It is Father Fichter who has written in the introduction to his *Social Relations in the Urban Parish* that "The intelligent Christian . . . will not fear the intrusion of science into the sanctuary". It might be argued that to use the term intrusion is somewhat to beg the question; but the sentiment is one which could command wider approval outside the Roman communion that is at present the case. It is principally in France and in Ireland that similar studies are being fostered on this side of the ocean.

In this country we are suspicious of the use of American sociological jargon, and we should do well not to assume that the special problems of that vast society are necessarily our own. Some of the current methods of presenting material and organising questionnaires used by French social investigators are complex and confusing. But this is no argument for ignoring the need to learn more about the present social setting of the Church. It is possible to apply ourselves to the problems which beset the Church in our own society, to use methods of investigation which are academically respectable and to present the results in intelligible English.

No application of the technique of sociological enquiry to problems of religious interest will prove fruitful unless it is met from the Church's side by the reawakening of a theological concern for society and the clarification of the unique position of the Church as a redeemed community over against the post-Christian secular order. This is not a distinction of the spiritual from the material: a false division too often found in sermons. The Archbishop of York, speaking of the Church, wrote: "Ontologically its members are reborn. Sociologically, they have fellowship with the Father and the Son through the in-dwelling Spirit, and no secular concept of fellowship means the same thing". It is this distinct quality of fellowship which makes the Church a unique institution, not to be assimilated to a government or a trade union. Sociological generalisations are not applicable to parishes in the same way that they are to local authorities. This is not to say that the institutional structure of the Church must never adjust itself to changing conditions, but only that if it is to do so willingly and consciously, the adjustment must be accompanied by the provision of social facts for the consideration of the clergy and by a renewal of applied Christian social thinking. Both these activities may be called either religious sociology or the sociology of religion; but it might be happier if neither term was used. The field of enquiry is single, but the social entities are dual. This is a lesson which the

Church should never forget and which students of religious institutions would do well to learn.

In his *De Civitate Dei* St. Augustine has described this important distinction. The citation is from John Healey's translation, Book XV, chapter ii. "Thus then we find this earthly city in two forms: the one presenting itself, and the other prefiguring the city celestial, and serving it. Our nature, corrupted by sin, produces citizens of earth: and grace freeing us from the sin of nature, makes us citizens of heaven: the first are called the vessels of wrath: the last, of mercy. And this was signified in the two sons of Abraham: the one of which being born of the bond woman, was called Ishmael, being the son of the flesh: the other, the freewoman's, Isaac, the son of promise. Both were Abraham's sons: but natural custom begot the first, and gracious promise the latter. In the first was a demonstration of man's use, in the second was a commendation of God's goodness."

Children Pose the Problems

WILLIAM PICKERING

"Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou has founded strength." (Psalm 8.2.) This verse is often expounded in the pulpit. Its religious significance for adults is not difficult to see, but its application in fields of objective and scientific study may not at first be obvious. In speaking about the problems of industrial society, and more particularly the task of evangelism within it, there is a natural tendency to view the problems in an adult fashion, which is proper and understandable, and to draw on material relating only to adult situations, which is more open to question. Somehow or other, the situation is only analysed in the case of people of 15 years of age or over. Are not the problems of man's "irreligion" also to be found writ large before he has reached that stage?

In connection with some research I was undertaking on the place of religion in the social structure of certain industrial towns, I wished to see briefly if it were possible to trace back to certain children certain "distortions" in the churches, such as the preponderance of women worshippers and the weak affiliation in poor districts. It was decided to conduct a rapid survey in the schools in the area. A simple questionnaire was drawn up with about a dozen questions for children between the ages of 10 and 11. The children formed the top classes of junior mixed schools. Three out of a possible four schools co-operated and about 400 boys and girls were questioned; this was

just under two-thirds of the children of the age-group in the town. The head-teachers kindly co-operated, not only in allowing the survey to be undertaken, but in actually asking the children the questions themselves. Elementary safeguards were taken. Children replied by a cross or tick to the questions which were read out. There were no names on the answer sheets. Nothing was mentioned about denominational membership, and the questions were simple. "Do you go to Sunday school or church at all?"—"Do you go regularly?"—"Do you say prayers at night time?"

I must now say a word about the town itself, which we shall call Heddington. Heddington is an urban district in the northern half of England. It grew rapidly after the middle of the nineteenth century and since the First World War census figures have moved very slowly to the present level of about 20,000 inhabitants. It is essentially an industrial town. It is essentially a dirty town—some would call it one of the dirtiest in the country; in 1951 at one observation post, matter fell at the rate of 277 tons per square mile per annum. There are three collieries and a steelworks in the area, together with a few smaller industrial concerns. Both the collieries and the works tended to grow rapidly after 1850 when the arrival of the railway made transport easier. Except for limited housing estates on the outskirts of the town, Heddington is the epitome of late-Victorian and Edwardian urbanization of the least exciting kind. There are endless short streets of terraced houses, some ready for the demolition squad, others biding their time on account of their solid, wearisome usefulness. The town has had as many strikes and lock-outs as any community in the north, and indeed perhaps more, for a strike at a pit in 1904 involving several hundred men went on for three long, dreary years. The poverty and hard life that many of the inhabitants have endured is marked by ugly streets still not made up after fifty years, and by plots of waste land which are the frequent resort of young people. A stranger would call the town a "dump".

There was a time when the churches had a fair following. The 1851 religious census showed that 40 per cent of the people went to church. To-day it is only 8 per cent. The Nonconformists, particularly the Methodists, were responsible for a great deal of former religious activity. At one time they had ten chapels. Three have now been closed. The Roman Catholics have been the most recent comers on the scene. Their membership (Easter Duties) is just about equal to that of the Anglicans (Easter communicants) and both are slightly below Free Church membership (1954-525). Heddington—and a

number of Church leaders agree here—is about as tough a religious spot as any evangelist could want.

The three schools were conveniently situated in three distinct parts of the town. School A was reckoned to be the best school of its kind in the vicinity, judged by examination results and other criteria. It was situated in one of the cleaner and more desirable residential quarters. Near it were good terraced houses and council estates of 1918-1939 and post-World War II vintage.

School B was a Church school in the centre of the town. It was a small school and was not particularly well equipped. It drew people from very mixed social areas.

School C was situated in the industrial area of the town near to the works and in a part of the town which people for obvious reasons tended to leave rather than enter. Surrounding the school were terraced houses of a poor quality.

One of the first questions the children were asked was whether they went to Sunday school or church at all. Almost six out of every ten said they did and just under half said they went regularly. (By a church attendance survey it was discovered that about four-tenths of the children of the town were found in the Sunday schools.) By schools, 53 per cent went regularly in School A, 48 per cent in School B and 39 per cent in School C. In School A 62 per cent said they went sometimes, but in School C the percentage was 56. There is thus not only greater Sunday school affiliation in School A compared with School C, but a higher percentage of those who go, go regularly.

A quarter of the children went to church on weekday evenings for guides, brownies, scouts and the like. There was little differentiation between the three schools, but a contrast was more pronounced with regard to parents who themselves went to church. In School A 36 per cent of the parents attended church from time to time and 11 per cent attended regularly. In School B it was 21 per cent who went and 11 per cent who went regularly, while in School C 29 per cent attended church but only 8 per cent went Sunday by Sunday. The overall percentages were 31 and 10 respectively for those who went to a place of worship and those who went regularly. The swing between parents who attend a church or chapel occasionally and those who go frequently was greater in School A than in School C.

There was an interesting variation in the answers to the question whether the children said private prayers. On an average for the three schools just under seven out of ten answered "yes", but here the schools took a different order. Schools A, B and C had positive

percentages of 56, 86.5 and 76 respectively. But though credit must here be given to the Church school, it was found that children did not apparently find religious instruction an attractive subject. Out of a list of five subjects the children were asked to write down the order in which they preferred them. In the Church school 32 per cent put religious instruction last; in the other schools the percentage was about 25.

It was possible to divide the children according to their streams, A, B and C, and to add together the corresponding streams for the different schools. For example, it was found that for the most intelligent stream, stream A, three-quarters went to Sunday school, just over half in stream B and slightly under a half in stream C. Exactly the same order of streams was noted with regard to the other questions already raised. Stream A always had the most positive answers. With regard to private prayers, 70 per cent in stream A said prayers, 73 per cent in stream B and 56 per cent in stream C.

Only 55 per cent of the boys went to Sunday school compared with 69 per cent of the girls. There was about the same sexual difference among those who went to Sunday school regularly (47 per cent of the boys and 59 per cent of the girls) as well as among those who attended socio-religious activities at the church on a week night. In the saying of prayers there was the same discrepancy between boys and girls. Just under a half of the boys reckoned they said private prayers, but two-thirds of the girls. Boys and girls equally enjoyed going to church, but by contrast, scripture at school was far less popular with the boys than with the girls. Other points were that in just over nine-tenths of the homes there were Bibles, and in about the same number of homes religious services had been heard over the radio.

From the results it is seen that the greatest chances for a child becoming a regular church member go to a girl rather than a boy, in the upper half rather than the lower half of the intelligence scale, who at the same time comes from a "good" social area.

Such are the bare bones of the more important findings. One thing that clearly emerges is that even in an apparently uniform working class area wide variations relating to religious faith and practice can be observed. Industrial society is much more complex than it is sometimes made out to be, especially by members of the churches. Certain areas, usually the "toughest" in the neighbourhood, produced virtually no church members except a sprinkling of Roman Catholics, while

from the better terraced houses there was comparatively strong church-going.

This survey claims no startling results, but it does show that many of the problems of evangelism appear already among children.

Frontier Fixtures

Approach to Unity

A week-end for Anglicans and Methodists from 24th-26th January is being arranged by Kathleen Bliss and John Lawrence at Dunford College, Midhurst. The subject of the conference will be "Growing together—opportunities and obstacles". The chairman will be the Rev. Harold K. Moulton, a Methodist Minister and a Presbyter of the Church of South India from 1947-57, and now deputy Translation Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

The cost of the conference will be 50/- plus 10/- registration fee. Will those who are interested please write to the Rev. R. G. Bliss, Dunford College, Midhurst.

Theology in Central London

Mr. Daniel Jenkins, the chief executive officer of the Christian Frontier Council, will give a course of lectures this winter at the Kings' Weigh House Church Hall, Binney Street, W.1 (one minute west of Bond Street Tube Station), on "Belief in God To-day". The course will begin at 6 p.m. on Tuesday, 26th November. This is part of an attempt to provide more opportunities than exist at present in central London for the study of present-day theological issues. Anyone interested in the course is asked to get in touch with Mr. Jenkins at 21 Binney Street, W.1.

Lectures at St. Anne's House

St. Anne's Society present a programme of six lectures at 6.30 p.m. on Thursdays at St. Anne's House, 57 Dean Street, W.1.

Mr. Owen Barfield will speak on "Saving the Appearances" on 31st October, 7th November and 14th November, at 6.30 p.m. For an editorial appreciation of Mr. Barfield's book, *Saving the Appearance*, see CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER for July, page 8. Mr. Leslie Paul will take the chair at Mr. Barfield's lectures.

The Rev. William Pickering, who writes in this issue of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, will speak on "The Place of Religion in Modern Urban Society" on 21st and 28th November, and 5th December, at 6.30 p.m.

Frontier Chronicle

Living Churches

After many years, news is filtering through of the Lutherans in Central Siberia, the area to which many German-speaking people were deported in the 1930s and '40s. There may be as many as a million of them, and there are many reports that they have maintained church meetings and membership, often with the help of lay preachers. The Russian Lutheran Church was officially dissolved in 1938; but in September

1955 its members were again granted religious liberty and citizenship rights.

It has been possible to send from Germany some quantities of church equipment, such as harmoniums, Bibles and church stationery. (A pastor wrote asking for no less than 10,000 confirmation certificates.) So far all attempts by Lutheran World Federation officials to visit these Siberian congregations have failed.

A Foreign Legion for Slum Clearance ?

The Abbé Pierre, visiting recently the *Interbau* exhibition of modern architecture at Berlin, expressed some fear that modern youth, impressed by the promise of "The City of the Future", would forget the sad realities which exist in so many urban areas of the world today. He has suggested that young people from different countries should join together to volunteer their services in a new kind of foreign legion, working for twelve months without pay on different construction projects.

This idea deserves to be taken seriously. If National Service dwindles away, it should not be at all impossible for young students, at least, to find one

year for such work. And the extraordinary success of the World Council of Churches' "work camps" deserves more attention than it has received—if only for their effect on the ecumenical outlook of the churches when these young people grow into positions of responsibility later.

A real international fellowship of young lay Christians is developing under our very eyes. Could not the World Council Youth Department look into the matter, remembering that no doubt it was not church buildings which the Abbé Pierre had primarily in mind?

The American Missionary Today

The Missionary Research Library, New York, has made a typically careful and thorough survey of the strength of American missions abroad, based on returns for the year 1956. The number of "Protestant" (including Episcopal) missionaries overseas has increased some 25 per cent on the 1952 figure, and now reaches a total of over 23,400, sent abroad by some 213 different missionary agencies, with a total annual

expenditure of some 130,000,000 dollars.

Two major problems are noted. One is that ecumenical co-operation between these bodies is, if anything, increasingly difficult to achieve. Only some 42 per cent of these 23,000 missionaries belong to agencies affiliated to the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ (the equivalent of our British Council of Churches). No fewer than 58 per

cent belong to independent or to fundamentalist mission bodies, which sometimes compete with one another and with local churches in India and Africa, and which often reflect extremely conservative views in their theology, politics, and evangelistic techniques. Another difficulty in strengthening the international and ecumenical character

of the missionary movement is the steady trend towards American dominance of many mission fields, reflecting, of course, the prosperity and the more sacrificial giving of many American congregations. In 1911, some 34 per cent of the non-Roman missionaries in the world were American: the figure is now nearly 68 per cent.

Experiment in Aberdeen

Scotland's first *Kirk Week* at Aberdeen last August does not seem to have attracted as much general attention as it deserves. This meeting of some 1150 delegates was not just another church conference, it was an important experiment in lay training, owing some of its ideas to the German *Kirchentag* movement, but adding some extremely interesting modifications to the Continental pattern of Bible studies and mass meetings.

The greatest achievement of the week were the discussion groups. There were some eighty in all, with lay chairmen, and not more than twenty members in each. This meant complicated organisation, a good deal of trudging along damp Aberdeen streets to formidable high schools and academies, and, at first, no little awkwardness and embarrassment as people from widely different church backgrounds began to put forward their independent opinions. But here was an unrivalled opportunity for lay people to develop and to express their own ideas on the themes of *Kirk Week*; and by the Saturday it was quite evident that this was happening.

Indeed, with complete courtesy but distinct frankness, representations were made that the direction of *Kirk Week* was a good deal too clerical, and that its leaders in the future should not only ask the laity to do things but should itself accept a good deal more lay leadership.

Dr. Robert Mackie, on behalf of the *Kirk Week* executive, generously and rapidly welcomed these demands—and they were almost immediately implemented. One of the final acts of the week was to appoint a new committee of twenty, with thirteen lay people on it and seven clergy. A great deal depends on the efficiency and success of this new body: if it works speedily and sacrificially to keep the *Kirk Week* movement going, there may soon be a new liveliness in Scottish church life. In Dr. Mackie's own words: "Today the Church is waking up to its true function, and the world cannot stop it . . . It is through ordinary men and women that the Church touches the world at every point, and in every aspect of its life".

Emigration to Edinburgh

A new liveliness in Scottish lay-people will need to be stimulated, informed and educated by every means that can be found. Fortunately the Church of Scotland now has a fine opportunity to reach out to its members, for it has accepted the munificent gift of the *British Weekly*, offered to it by the Rowntree Trust. Some people have very strongly criticised the *British Weekly* in recent months, and have called its articles and editorials "irres-

ponsible". Others, perhaps, have been slightly afraid of it; and have seemed sometimes to avoid rather than to answer some of its sharper comments. It will be a thousand pities if the radical and critical tones in its contents are entirely ironed out: it must be more than a "house journal" for the Presbyterian establishment if it is to satisfy the kind of lay-people who became articulate at Aberdeen.

An Ambitious Venture

The well-known temperance organisation, the *United Kingdom Alliance*, has in recent years been widening its interests a good deal. It has now set up a *Christian Economic and Social Research Foundation*, which has recently issued an interesting pamphlet: "Setting up a Home", a study in the difficulties faced by 669 young families in London, Leeds and Birmingham.

This booklet (obtainable from 12 Caxton Street, W.1, for 2s.) has been carefully prepared with the help of skilled market research workers; and it raises very clearly the difficulties which hire purchase regulations and interest charges present to young workers trying to equip their homes. Its publication, however, and the establishment of the Foundation itself, raise some rather ticklish problems.

Clearly the Foundation is primarily concerned with the question as to how

far young people are driven to drink by the difficulties of modern industrial life. For instance, among the tentative conclusions we find the question: "Are there not young mothers already in circumstances which tempt them to accept defeat and turn to alcohol in an effort to escape?" Such pre-occupations (though perfectly legitimate for the Alliance) and the whole shape and style of the survey, will inevitably detract from the impact which it may make on informed public opinion and on the already considerable body of investigators who are studying town life in Britain today.

Is it really feasible to establish a Foundation for Christian Economic and Social Research in this way? Might it not be perhaps better to set up some research posts (without too many strings attached) in a reputable university department of social science?

Young Germans Look at Life

GOTTFRIED WEBER

At the recent lay training course at Oud Poelgeest, Holland, Herr Gottfried Weber, who was on the staff of the Evangelical Academy at Bad Boll until earlier this year, gave this account of his work with industrial apprentices.

In the summer of 1954 we invited young people from six factories to come to some camping conferences. Sometimes we were allowed to organise meetings of young workers in the factories to tell them about these camps, but sometimes we were only allowed to stick an invitation on the notice board illustrated by some pictures of the region where the conferences would take place. The participants had to use up part of their holidays for it, and had to pay the costs themselves. And one hour after the notices were posted all places were taken. In some factories we had to draw lots for the places. In others we had to refuse about 100 people places. So off we went to the Tyrol. The conferences were led by four students—two theological students and two others—and by me. Each camp lasted ten days; so that we, the team, had to live the life of savages for six weeks!

The purpose of these first camps was to contact a group of young people from each factory in order to start some kind of club work with these people during the winter. We concentrated on the young people who were in a position to take some kind of initiative, because we hoped that by them we could reach others. But it was a real job to find these young leaders. We got involved in the whole question of how leadership works among these young factory workers. The third task we imposed upon ourselves was to try to find a method of proclaiming the gospel to young workers who are right outside the Church—in such a way that they do not retire into their shells when they hear talk about religion, but open up and ask frank questions.

After the camps the young workers were visited at their homes and in their factories. We also spoke with their parents, and with their employers. Some were invited to come to a social evening; others were asked to the home of one of my assistants. During the holidays two of our team lived in the neighbourhood of our factories, did the visiting, and were available for talks at night. Every four or six weeks a bigger meeting was organised, with a general invitation to it. Besides

that, everyone had the chance of attending a week-end course at the Evangelical Academy at Bad Boll. Of course, he had to pay his own cost in that case. This was a good way of testing the real concern of these young people for the things offered them, for these were closely related to their purses!

We learnt from these young workers that the world in which they live is totally different from the world in which the clergy and school teachers live. Those things which we think of as important in human and ethical relations are simply not the questions which they ask about in the world of industry. A man in industry does not live any longer with any free space in which to manoeuvre, with any freedom to develop himself. He is part of a tight system, which fixes the way he shall go. He just obeys the coloured lights. This development has inevitably formed our modern ways of work and organisation. It is no good talking about the "good old days"; nor is there any hope in trying to put back the clock in industry. We have been seeking, therefore, to find what we can do to help young people to stand the strain, that is to say, how we can make them so fit and strong that they still stay fully human beings while at the same time working in modern industry.

This is the kind of method we have used. The first thing these young people want us to do is to give them *relevant* information about themselves—and about everything which concerns them. They are at an age when they are particularly concerned about their physical development, when they feel foreigners to themselves, and are therefore uncertain about their behaviour. Now this uncertainty is reinforced by the lack of variety in their experience. They adapt themselves to one situation only—life in their particular factory—and it is very difficult for them to find their way in any different situation. This often even becomes a psychological complex with them. Our young workers no longer have a working-class complex, because they are no longer so class conscious. They feel more like people lost in a jungle, in which they have no idea where to go. I believe that this is the reason for their dislike of every kind of organised activity. They say "What's the use of all these clubs? The people there can't answer our kind of questions: they live in the day before yesterday. And in any case they only see us as recruits and members: they don't really need us as human beings". We hear a lot of talk in Germany about the "unorganised" or unregulated young men: that is only an expression of the resentment felt by our youth organisations about them.

In actual fact, our youth is looking very hard for *genuine* groups to join. For instance they like very much to come together in very small

groups, preferably for private discussions. One will say, "You can talk better like that: you can't speak about such and such a matter with many people about". A private talk in a small circle together demands a greater frankness of speech than a meeting in a large group. What are the questions they want to ask? When you ask them this question you seldom get any direct answer. We have found that first of all they need a subject to get their teeth into, and out of this will come topics with which they can, so to speak, camouflage their own personal questions. The first information has to come from us; and either we offer them the stuff in short talks, or we send them written material which we have selected and prepared ourselves

Here are some examples of this. We know that these young people are at an age when they may very likely fall in love. And we have also found out in many private talks that they feel desperate about their relations with the other sex. So perhaps we start with the general question: What is Life? How does it arise? What is the difference between human life and the life of plants and animals? Probably these themes do not urge them directly to many questions. But perhaps it happens that later on the same evening, when we are sitting together, somebody asks, "Well, what do you think about Jazz?" Of course this is a subject on its own; and is not necessarily related to the theme "What is Life"? But on one occasion the following thing happened. We tried to tackle this question, and fetched some records in order to give some examples of jazz styles. And then the same young man said, "Are you allowed to dance to this music?" And then: "By the way, why is it that dancing is allowed at the Academy? I thought good Christians were not allowed to dance . . ." And by now private conversation had ceased, and everybody was listening. More and more joined in; and by one o'clock in the morning questions came up like: "Can you have harmless friendships between boys and girls?" Can you have more than one girl friend at a time?" "When do you think you should kiss a girl?" and "Should you have any sexual experience before marriage?" And opinions arose about girl friends: "Should you look for a girl you can do anything with, as well as one who will be just a friend?" Somebody asked: "What should the girl be like that you finally want to marry?" And some one answered "Well, if she's between twenty and thirty she doesn't want to be a stay-at-home, but she must be able to be a good mother to my children, and that's not possible if she's lived a loose life!"

I won't spend any longer on this example; but I wanted to show you a "camouflaged" question—because the question about jazz was not the

fundamental one: those came at 1 a.m. We also give information on such topics as jazz, fashions, films, literature, politics, industrial questions, etc. We don't mind what kind of subject we start with. What is more important is that we did not stick to obviously educational questions, but got the participants themselves to develop a subject.

And this led to our next step: to make the young men try consciously to adapt themselves to the surroundings—to struggle with the stuff! At this stage the talks disappeared to the background, the young people produce the questions, and have to find the answers. Up to this point we have the chance to work with them as teachers and pastors, but the third step is beyond our control. It must lead to personal decision and a real engagement in the situation. We can accompany our young people to this very point. We can be their counsellors and help them. But the decisions and the ways they work out the decisions are things we must leave to them. The only thing we must be quite clear about is to make sure that our friendship with them does not depend upon a certain decision. To put this quite bluntly: a man must remain my friend even when he decides against Christ.

The next step is for the young people to take over some responsibility for themselves. To guide young people to the point where they are willing to take responsibility is one of our most important tasks in German education today. Our democracy is a young one, and we are quite willing to refuse responsibility if we can. So I am very happy about one small result of our work. We have in Germany a law which says that every firm must choose a representative for every fifty young people. This law started in 1954. Now in the course of time out of six factories in which we have been working: in two of them all five representatives were young men with whom we had been working, and in the other three factories three out of the five belonged to our groups—though we never in any way tried to influence the choice of representatives.

I have tried to show you our methods of training—first information, then getting to grips with the questions, then a free and personal decision, and finally the taking of responsibility. Everything we do is derived from the idea that young people need tolerance—and a chance to develop themselves in reasonable freedom. This includes a training in life even when there is no immediate purpose in hand. In the modern world, only those things which have an immediate purpose are done: and therefore this world is so miserably earnest! We must learn to play, to enjoy things. And so we have a very free atmosphere about our programmes: if something comes along which seems more important

to us than the things which we have prepared, then we take it up. As much as possible is arranged by the young people themselves. And we attach great importance to celebrations and a convivial atmosphere. In every course one evening is planned in which the participants are invited to our homes. In this way they learn that there is a relation between drinking and conversation—because the things with which we are dealing produce a certain atmosphere among the group. And whether we drink tea or beer, or on the other hand wine, makes quite a difference, not in quality but in atmosphere. We want to teach the young people to experience deeply the small things of everyday—which do not cost much money, nor require any outstanding talents: a cup of tea, a joke or two, or a serious talk, or both at the same time—a discussion or a game.

The young people who came to us have had no Christian presuppositions. From their religious education they had for the most part only unpleasant memories. Nevertheless it was the form of the preaching, not the content of the Gospel, which they were really critical of. They commented on the form of the service, the language of the sermons and hymns, the methods of preparation for confirmation, and the often very much antiquated ideas which their pastors had about contemporary questions. So we had to arrange a kind of code in order to understand one another. And the best thing I can do is to give you an example of how we tried to do this. In the planning of every conference we left some space for the proclamation of the Gospel—but we never fixed the time in the conference for it. There was each time in our team one minister, who was kept free from groups and discussions: he wandered around listening to groups, and collected questions which seemed to him important. When he had enough for his service or his talk he withdrew from the conference and prepared his address in relation to the questions raised by the working groups.

I have always had the experience that young people from outside the Church who are involved in industrial work are really quite open to hear the Gospel, that they are even very hungry for it, and will gladly listen. But we must be willing to give them a chance of *struggling* with the Gospel—for only then can its power become evident.

Crime and Sin

LETITIA FAIRFIELD

Some reflections on the Wolfenden Report.

One of the immediate and surprising results of the Wolfenden Report is to have made religion popular in quarters where scant attention is usually paid to episcopal pronouncements. Unfortunately this seems to be due largely to muddled thinking on both sides. How far is it true and relevant that there is a rigid distinction between crime and sin, and that acts done in private are not of public concern? It seems to have been news to many people (who could never have read *Measure for Measure*) that the Christian churches neither expected nor desired all sins to be made criminal offences by the State, and that there was a sphere of private conduct best left to the conscience to regulate. So far so good, but these truisms have been expanded on the clerical side into curious doctrines of non-interference with moral issues, hitherto unknown to the law, and on the side of the public into a welcome message that sinners should be allowed to do as they please provided, as Mrs. Patrick Campbell said, "they don't frighten the horses", and it is up to the horses not to be too particular.

As Lord Denning has now pointed out (Address to the Law Society's conference, *The Times*, 27th September, 1957) "It is impossible to draw a hard and fast line between law and sin", but he added "I would say most emphatically that standards of morals are the concern of the law, and that whether done in private or in public". In maintaining that it is not the business of the law to interfere with private behaviour, certain eminent Churchmen seem to have gone much too far. The circumstances surrounding the commission of sins vary with every kind of sinning and may come under the censure of either civil or criminal law. The speakers are obliged to concede that special circumstances do justify the punishment of incest, but they ignore many other instances in existing legislation. Suicide, and attempted suicide, a very personal act, was always heavily penalised by both secular and ecclesiastical courts and no one has suggested that the present laws against the attempt are immoral. Adultery has serious legal consequences (i.e. deprivation of the custody of children), and although it was punishable by imprisonment under the Indian Penal Code until we left India, no religious objection was ever raised to my knowledge.

The basic principle which makes a sin properly cognisable by the law (civil or criminal) is surely whether it takes the form of an "overt act", not whether that act is performed in private or in public, though the distinction is used for certain limited purposes. "Dangerous (or immoral) thoughts" should be in every Christian state a matter between ourselves and God, but once an act provable in evidence has been committed it depends on the nature of the act, and on the circumstances leading up to it and following after, whether the law is wise to take notice of it or not, and the decision lies in the hands of the legislature guided by the public. Surely Lord Denning was right in pointing out that law is an important element in the maintenance of moral standards—"for a great many people and for those who have no religion and no conscience the law is the only standard".

Having established that Christians are certainly not bound to approve of legal penalties for acts of private immorality but may do so if the community thinks it desirable in the public interest, the discussion of homosexuality might, I think, usefully concentrate on some of the practical proposals which this otherwise excellent report leaves vague. On three points it is especially necessary for Christians (who however tolerant and charitable they may be, are concerned that homosexual practices should not in fact spread) to obtain more information. Firstly, what did the Service witnesses think the effect of making homosexual acts legal for adult civilians would be? Would it give rise to serious discontent if offenders were punished under Naval or Military Law and civilians got off scot free? Would it be workable to distinguish between Service men above and below 21? So long as we must have armed Services the moral atmosphere into which young men are sent is a very serious responsibility for the whole community.

Secondly, what sort of "flaunting" behaviour as regards advertisements, entertainments, etc., would the public be expected to tolerate if police powers to control it were abolished? We must remember we are dealing not with a few high-minded if abnormal individuals but with a large number of rebels determined to establish their own "way of life".

Thirdly, what happens in countries where no penalties for adult homosexuality exist? The Wolfenden Report barely touches on these matters but they would seem to be essential to the formation of a sound judgment on changes in the law.

Concentration of Economic Power in Asia

JOHN HEALEY

"Everywhere in Asia concentration of economic power in the hands of a few private groups is seen to be dangerous . . . it is not surprising that throughout Asia there is a rising popular demand for the State to control or direct industrial production." (Christianity and the Asian Revolution, p.34). In those countries which have considerable manufacturing industry, ownership and control is in the hands of a few well-known families of industrialists or financiers. This concentrated control extends beyond industry, however, for as Dr. Djohadikisoma of Indonesia points out, these groups "by combining their business with imports of manufactured goods from industrial countries . . . control or at least influence the supply of finished goods within the country. It is not uncommon that through an intricate system of corporate structures they also have their hand in banking and other financial institutions, land transport as well as shipping. The powerful influence of such oligopolistic groups in the economic process is increased by the fact that they sometimes finance the commercial middlemen to whom the producers in rural areas live in a state of debt." It ought to be remembered that economic power also gives political power in these areas.

In India, for example, in 1951, eighteen firms controlled 458 companies while 1.3 per cent of the total number of companies account for 42 per cent of the total company capital invested. A more significant index of the power of monopoly (or rather oligopoly) in Indian manufacturing industry is the percentage of employment in each industry controlled by the three largest firms in that industry. This percentage varies from 14 per cent in cotton textiles to over 80 per cent in iron and steel and petroleum. Industries differ in importance of course and the weighted averaged for all industry is about 25 per cent. These figures give some hint of the extent of control over men and resources in the hands of a group of men in one Asian country.

Indian and Asian opinion at present believes that such concentration of economic power and wealth is unjust and that the way to improve this situation is to increase State control or nationalisation of these private groups. Let us consider this view.

It is usually said, with a considerable amount of truth, that such inequality in Asia is the historical result of avarice, exploitation, unscrupulousness, luck and State help. But it is usually forgotten that it has also been due to enterprise, foresight and hard work. The Marxist inspired dogma (so popular now in Asia among non-Marxists even) that economic inequality is always due to exploitation has never been adequately substantiated.

In the post-war period in India, Government investigations into monopolistic industries suggest that only two of them—sugar and rubber tyres—have been guilty of exploiting the public by charging excessively high prices for their goods.

A further criticism is that such concentration of wealth causes inequality of income and opportunity and inequality in the enjoyment of income so that the luxury needs of some get priority over the subsistence needs of others. This is undoubtedly a very important source of social injustice in Asia and would be viewed as such by every Christian on the basis of the Old Testament alone. In this article we have ignored the inequality of property and power at the rural village level in Asia. The Rural Credit Survey of India (1954) gives a very disturbing review of social injustices by certain local landlords, traders and moneylenders—excessive rates of interest, indebtedness, caste discrimination, urban minded policy, deliberate obstruction of local co-operative movements, etc. In places this contemporary Asian document reads unpleasantly like Amos.

There is, however, a different type of social injustice that can arise from concentration of wealth and power, and one which is of more importance although not often mentioned. The Parable of the Unjust Steward brings out the point. In this parable the steward was condemned primarily not for his dishonesty but for his wastefulness and imprudence. Perhaps the greatest judgment that may be brought against those controlling the industrial power in Asia is that they have not increased the industrial wealth of these lands at their potentially maximum rate. Perhaps the greatest social injustice is that those in power have “wasted their goods” and failed in the duty of stewardship of the resources of man and materials given into their hands. Justice in the social order is a question not only of distribution but of the growth of wealth.

Historically every increase in wealth has taken place on the basis of a high degree of inequality and concentration of economic power. There is no reason why Asia should be an exception to this law. In Asia where an increase in wealth is so urgently needed, the issue of

social justice centres on whether private conglomerations of property and power have used or will use these resources with the maximum efficiency, initiative and prudence.

In India where "a few leading families control and guide the industrial destinies of the country, fresh and young blood seldom finds opportunity to enter the closely preserved and well-organised oligarchy" and where loyalties of caste, kin and community are strong, there is the continual danger that industrial and trading resources will fall into the hands of those unsuited to their management and stewardship. The debate continues. As yet there is no convincing evidence to prove that the private groups have failed to use their control of resources to the greatest advantage of the country.

Should the State take over and control these private monopoly groups in the interests of social justice? Asian opinion is strongly in favour of this policy today although it may have serious limitations which they have as yet overlooked.

If the State does increase its control of private property it is often forgotten that there will be a considerable *increase* in the concentration of economic power—only in different hands. Power in itself is neutral but it can be used for unjust purposes and there is no reason why the State should not misuse its power any more than private groups or individuals. In fact private groups in the face of the continual threat of nationalisation and under the very suspicious eye of public opinion are probably more careful not to misuse their power than public bodies. If the State proceeds to swallow up private industrial and trade groups it will thereby remove some of the most powerful sources of criticism and countervailing power in the political and economic field in Asia. With weak parliamentary opposition in many of these lands, powerful private interests are essential as bulwarks against excessive State interference with action and thought.

Public corporations are as likely to be poor stewards as private companies in these lands. They have a tendency to be cautious and procrastinating and are often less visionary than is commonly thought. There is no reason why officials should be any more disinterested or just in their actions than private individuals. They are as likely to be motivated by considerations of power, prestige, position and even profit as anyone else and despite all the checks to corruption which modern administrations can devise, they are strongly open to the temptations facing all men. Only men living consciously under the judgment of God and with a sense of mission to their fellow men are likely to make concentration of economic power satisfy the demands of social justice.

Have the governments of Asian countries got a monopoly of such men?

Illustrations of the misuse of concentrated economic power are not difficult to find in Asia. So the Christian Church in Asian lands should be able to see very clearly the abuses to which concentration of economic power gives rise. It should point out that it is wrong to ascribe these abuses exclusively to private monopolies and not to State monopolies. It is the nature of man which is suspect.

The task of the Churches in these lands, while giving the State the allegiance rightfully due to it, is to watch its claims and give clear voice to the dangers of concentrated economic power into whosesoever hands it falls. The State and citizens of non-Christian countries possess a knowledge of good and evil given by God, but the Christians of these lands can add considerably to this insight on the basis of their faith and scriptures. The small and often weak Churches in Asia have an important part to play. Are not Asian Christians called to be not only as harmless as doves but as wise as serpents?

Letters to the Editor

DEAR SIR,

Mr. J. I. Packer's admirably candid comments on *Fundamentalism and the Church of God* both please and puzzle one who is not of his persuasion but loves Holy Scripture and is grieved to be denied a claim to "Biblical Christianity". The puzzling part is that which he declares to be the crux of the whole debate: namely that "Christ and the apostles accepted and taught the 'Scripture principle'—i.e. that whatever God has given to the Church is finally authoritative for faith and practice, and must be allowed to stand in judgement upon both public traditions and private opinions".

I do not wish to dissent from the second half of that sentence (though its meaning is somewhat obscure—what are these "public traditions?" and how are the "private opinions" of the exegete, Evangelical or otherwise, themselves brought under judgement?): but on the first half I offer the following comments, apologising for their rather elementary nature:

- (1) In the time of Christ and the apostles the New Testament was not yet completed.
- (2) Nowhere in their teaching is there to be found an explicitly formulated doctrine of the nature of Scriptural authority.

- (3) The repeated formula of Jesus "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time . . . but I say unto you . . ." plainly suggests that His fulfilment of the Old Testament also involved re-interpretation.
- (4) John 5.39 is not, I think, an isolated proof-text in this discussion—"Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to Me, that ye may have life." For it is a fact that those who were most scrupulous in their devotion to Scripture crucified the Lord—and, lest that should appear a bitter debating point, let us add "those who were most jealous for Church order". Neither way lies insurance.

Yours faithfully,

PATRICK C. RODGER.

Claverdale, 33 Woodside Grange Road,
London, N.12.

DEAR MR. LAWRENCE,

I have read Philip Lee-Wolf's article and J. I. Packer's review of Father Gabriel Hebert's book on "Fundamentalism".

As one who was brought up in one of the American Fundamentalist sects (whether "wild" or not I cannot say) and who has become a "liberal" or a "modernist" as far as a layman understands these terms, I would like to make one point.

Are there not two aspects of a church? One used to hear about a "Church Temporal" and a "Church Spiritual," but this may not be the best illustration for my purpose. It is clear that part of the Church's whole activity is to draw together and to help, the lost, the unlearned, those, perhaps the majority, who look for an "authority" in the troubled and incomprehensible world around them. For this majority there must be straightforward dogmas, an undisputed scripture, a moral code, a hope of salvation. Not for them theological and philosophical disputations about the nature of experience, of authority, of knowledge, of the soul. The work of the Church among these people is unquestionably vital. Those who do this work may, and often do, throw stones at the philosopher-theologians.

On the other hand, the revelation of God needs constantly to be made more explicit. More than that, it must be re-interpreted in the light of the advance of all kinds of knowledge and of experience. If the Temporal Church is to remain alive and to be effective, it must over the generations adapt itself to new thoughts, and to new truths. The Church has always recognised this. The adaptation is facilitated by the fact that there is no barrier between Fundamentalists and Modernists. Apart from extreme examples such as mine, there must be very many Christians who have a foot in both camps.

Clearly the "Fundamentalists" as described by Philip Lee-Wolf are not to be identified with the Fundamentalists of my boyhood days. They are said by Philip Lee-Wolf to have realised "the impossibility of holding to a liberalist and mechanical theory of the inspiration of the Scriptures". There are even to-day sects who would call them Laodicean Liberals. This is a good example of the adaptation of the dogmas of the Church Temporal.

The Fundamentalists must always be conscious of the danger of maintaining a position that will not only be unacceptable to an educated modern man of good will but will antagonise him.

The Modernists must be conscious of the danger of weakening the faith of the faithful, of mystifying, of forming an élite, of blunting the sword of the spirit, of losing the driving force without which the Kingdom of God will not come.

It seems to a simple layman that there is no need for argument. Both sides have their places, both are instruments of the same Spirit. A man will join one or the other side according to the gift he has.

Yours sincerely,

A. HEALEY.

Holly Cottage, South Heath,
Great Missenden, Bucks.

(I agree that there are simple ways and sophisticated ways of looking at the truth. But there is only one truth. The question is whether the different schools of churchmanship are in fact proclaiming the same truth. If not, how can they both have a place in the one church? In practice, every church combines simple and sophisticated people in one visible body (one wishes one could say "in one fellowship"), most churches include both Conservatists and Modernists, some churches combine Catholic and Protestant elements in their ecclesiastical polity. Is this intellectual dishonesty? Or is it a necessary expression of the unity in diversity of the members of Christ? I have my own views about the answer to that question but the answer is not obvious and must not be taken for granted, as Mr. Healey seems to do.—J. W. L.)

THE LORD'S PRAYER

There is a continued demand for copies of PATER NOSTER, a meditation on the Lord's Prayer originally published as a supplement to "The Christian News-Letter" in January 1941.

Price 3d. each plus postage; 2s. 6d. a dozen post free from the Christian Frontier Council, 59 Bryanston Street, Marble Arch, London, W.1.

Book Reviews

(Toynbee's Gifford Lectures)

A Historian's Approach to Religion. Arnold Toynbee. (O.U.P. 21s.)

Toynbee's Gifford Lectures make an immediate impact. But they irritate by their diffuseness, by the author's tendency to pour out material upon the page. Toynbee maddens by his use of the capital letter, and by the resultant habit of erecting bogeymen with whom to fight ghost battles. For instance: Technology, and Technologist. To Toynbee the Technologist (who is Modern Man, *par excellence*) is at once technologist, technician and scientist. How many men do we actually meet who are all three at once? The creation of this bogeyman helps to weaken Toynbee's whole treatment of the very complex thing modern science actually is; and this, combined with his obvious *malaise* in matters of the history of philosophy (his generalizations on the subject of Greek ethical theory are vicious), gives a pervasively unsatisfactory quality to his understanding of the intellectual habits of the western world today.

Yet his book is valuable. The constant quotations from Bayle and from Locke's *Letters on Toleration* remind readers continually of the profound moral and spiritual impulses present in the Enlightenment. If the conceptions of human existence, of human knowledge and of human betterment, which informed e.g. the Encyclopædist, were crude and philistine as well as logically vulnerable, the impulses which drove them to seek light outside the competing religious traditions of a divided Christendom were profound enough and valid. The

Christian Churches have failed, as a matter of historical fact, to embody in their visible existence effective resistance to the temptation which St. Matthew made climactic in his narrative of the second Adam's ordeal in the wilderness. The temptation pressed most strongly and was most terribly victorious in the age of religious tumult which preceded the Enlightenment, an age of profound theological and spiritual perception, an age of the saints and of the martyrs, which was yet such an age only at the cost of unmentionable cruelties committed by powers which claimed not Christ's forgiveness, but his blessing, on what they did in His name. (Here, surely, is the tragedy, in the true Sophoclean sense, of the Christian of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.) In this part of his work Toynbee reviews most effectively for his readers the question given classical expression in Dostoevsky's image of the Grand Inquisitor.

Again we need not accept Toynbee's guidance as an historian to appreciate the power with which he conveys by his often comparatively trivial treatment of world-religious differences how truly scandalous the "Scandal of particularity" must be. His survey, by its breadth, conveys remarkably the inwardness of that scandal, the shocking character of the Christian claim. To read his pages is to be brought sharply up against a tremendous assumption, the awful uniqueness of Christ. But from the problem of faith, and the consequent problem of theology (of "faith seek-

ing understanding"), there is no escape, except to abandon the "way of faith".

Toynbee is uncritically in favour of "religion": uncritically both in the sense that he altogether by-passes the theological critique of post-Kantian *Religions-philosophie*, and in the sense that he would, as a man trained in the school of *Literae Humaniores* in what some would call its golden age, find much both vulgar and even barbaric in the contemporary popular Christian catch-phrase, "Christ abolished religion". For him all true religion has much to do with suffering and humility: and of these concerns he finds a supremely moving expression in Paul's famous appeal to the Philippians to cultivate the mind of Christ, who found in equality to God not a booty to be grabbed and held, but who rather emptied himself, etc.

One can perhaps distinguish two moments, one valid, and one invalid, in this preoccupation. Toynbee is shocked, and communicates to us in a way at once illuminating and creative the shock he has experienced in recalling the bitter history of the Christian will to persecute. The image of the Christ stretched on the Cross, "become our pleading for us", sets a question-mark against whole tracts of Church history. Toynbee would see in those tracts something akin to

a betrayal, by religion, of its very essence: a betrayal that has in it something akin to the begetting by an Hegelian concept of its contradictory. But here we deal less with a process of dialectical logic than with one of sheer evil. To be compelled to face this question, to take seriously the protest of the Enlightenment, is for Christians a matter of sheer obligation.

But Toynbee goes further than this. For him—"learning lies in suffering". Almost he seems to ask us to see the *via crucis*, the last journey of the Son of Man, *sub specie Aeschyli*. But it does not follow for the Christian that if he can only learn the meaning of the *kenosis*, i.e. of Christ's emptying himself for the Incarnation by pondering the realities of Gethsemane and Calvary, that therefore his faith is primarily a "learning how to suffer," an *askesis* which will teach him "the role of suffering in human life", or help him find "the right attitude to suffering".

Paradoxical though it may sound, those who construed Christianity so were often in practice those best able by elaborating and stressing a theologically invalid concept of world-renunciation to silence prophecy in the name of humility. So prophecy against just those appalling evils of empirical Church history which Toynbee stresses was driven to find

Russia in the Making

JOHN LAWRENCE

"An admirable survey of Russian history from the Varangians to Krushchev. It is a real survey not a textbook in disguise . . . as an introduction to Russian history the book is most acceptable." A. J. P. TAYLOR in *The New Statesman*.

25s. net

ALLEN & UNWIN

its language elsewhere than in the tradition of the Scriptures. Once suppose that to see suffering as the key to life, *tout court*, is the essence of religion, and once find in Christianity a supreme expression of that principle already affirmed as the essence of religion, and one has dis-

credited both religion—and Christianity. For the Christian, the secret of life is not in suffering, but in the Crucified Christ, judge of suffering as much as of philosophy, of metaphysics, of science, and of religion, "because He is the Son of Man".

D. M. MACKINNON.

Breaking up the Happy Home

Family and Kinship in East London. Michael Young and Peter Willmott.
(Kegan Paul. 25s.)

No one would deny that good housing conditions are essential to the building up of happy family life. For the young family removed from a slum dwelling in an industrial area to a new housing estate on the verge of the countryside, the modern house, the new school building and other amenities would seem ideal. And yet it has become increasingly evident that all is not well with our friends who have moved out. Separated as they are from relations and friends, they miss the warmth and mutual help of the community life in the old borough. Consequently many of them suffer from an acute sense of loneliness and insecurity. This raises the question whether the present method of selection of tenants for rehousing in the new areas is satisfactory, but hitherto we have lacked the careful research which is required to put the case in a realistic manner.

It is good therefore to find that the Institute of Community Studies has been at work on the ground and we now have this valuable and interesting report on their survey. *Family and Kinship in East London* is a fascinating book, and it presents a balanced picture of normal family life. This is indeed refreshing and salutary. So much has been written about the abnormal family, and so many false assumptions made concerning the habits and character of

manual workers and their family relations.

Moreover, as Professor Titmuss writes in his foreword: "Unfaithful and distorted views about the family do influence public policies".

The purpose of the survey was to find out what happened to family life when people move to a new housing estate. This led the inquiry back to Bethnal Green to study the background from which the people living on the new estate had come. The book is divided into two parts: the first describes the borough and the second the estate.

It is interesting to see that the members of the research team were not prepared for what they actually found in the old borough. From their reading of social science they had gathered that as a result of changes set in motion by the Industrial Revolution the ancient pattern of the family consisting of grandparents, parents, uncles and aunts and their children had died out. They were therefore very surprised to discover that this was not so. In Bethnal Green, as in many other places, the wide family relationship is very much alive, and the code of rights and duties is still observed. In following this course I believe that the inquiry has picked up the major clue to the right pattern for family relations and for the basis of good community life.

The description of family life in Bethnal Green does, of course, reveal its difficulties and restrictions. Mum's powerful influence may be irritating, but she is respected and loved by all the members of the family, because she not only governs but also serves and takes responsibility. There is mutual help and sharing among the family and an accepted code of rights and duties. The way this flows out through the family and their friends to the local community is well described in the chapter on kinship and community.

To those who have been brought up in this environment it is no wonder that the new estate seems cold and dull. Members of the family and friends do not drop in, and there are no social gatherings in the pub.

The movement of young families has also left its mark on the old borough. Some of the men still come

in daily to work in the docks and other industries. But, since they no longer take any active part in local affairs, the life of the community is poorer. There is, too, a sharp increase in the percentage of old people in the population. And now a bitter cry goes up about the lack of responsibility on the part of the young for their aged parents and grandparents. This is not so in East London and many other places when the pattern of family life has not been disturbed. But obviously when the family is broken up, the business of mutual help often becomes impossible. The married daughter moved to the new estate is not able to leave her young children and travel the long distance to care for her aged relations. Indeed, this is one of the causes of anxiety and unhappiness. Here is a clear example of the danger of breaking up the family.



SPREADING THE GOSPEL

It is the task of the Church to take the Gospel to all men. She cannot

fulfil her vocation if she neglects those whom the business of seafaring takes from Home and Church.

This Society, now working in 80 ports throughout the world, urgently needs the help of missionary-hearted people.

General Superintendent:

REV. CYRIL BROWN, O.B.E., M.A.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN

4 BUCKINGHAM PALACE GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.1

The survey deals with other important matters such as family relations and family planning. Here there is evidence of a new kind of companionship between husband and wife and a nearer approach to equality between man and woman. There is also a valuable section on employment and the effects of social and economic changes.

In the concluding chapter the

authors make a strong plea for more freedom of choice; the freedom of choice for one generation to live with or near an older or younger generation.

We sincerely hope that the book will be widely read, especially by those who are responsible for housing planning and policy.

ETHEL UPTON.

Discovering the Real Person

The Meaning of Persons. Paul Tournier. (S.C.M. 25s.)

All the world's a stage

And all the men and women merely players:

They have their exits and their entrances;

And one man in his time plays many parts. . . .

Shakespeare, as the translator of this book from the French reminds us, has stated simply the facts: from them comes the problem with which Dr. Tournier is dealing in the first part of his book. People are not as they appear to their audience; what are they really like? From his "privileged observation post" as a psychiatrist Dr. Tournier has had patients revealing themselves to him as completely as they were able, but he frankly confesses that amassing information about the patient is like peeling layers off an onion—he does not find the real person underneath. He describes in some detail and with a wealth of examples from his cases the complexity of the personage that is revealed. This analytical approach is familiar enough in these days of popular psychology, but Dr. Tournier describes it with an absence of technical jargon that is refreshing.

Nevertheless the reader will expect more than a diagnosis, and perhaps the English title is liable to lead one to expect too much, for the book is not primarily a philosophical account of the nature of man, but is a testi-

mony to an experience in personal relationships which he interprets in terms of his own strong religious faith. The transforming relationship that results when doctor and patient meet as equals, man to man, is his dominant theme. This encounter can only take place if each has been willing to be ruthlessly honest and to trust the other person. In such an I-Thou relationship the real person in each of us is discovered. The author acknowledges his debt to Martin Buber, and the reader will recognise similarities with Joe Oldham's *Real Life is Meeting* and *Life is Commitment*. The experience of which the author speaks is by no means limited to the consulting-room. Who has not known that sudden *rapport* with a friend during a frank conversation, or more likely, in a period of silence afterwards?

One fundamental point that Paul Tournier makes about this encounter is that as a spiritual experience it has the same quality as the encounter with God that comes in the deeper levels of prayer. He is led to conclude that prayer is the key to our

... AND STILL THEY COME



Daily, even hourly, the world's suffering millions are joined by others, plodding hopefully across the frontiers between fear and freedom.

The responsibility of Christians to the swelling army of uprooted people is as unending as the stream of refugees. Inter-Church Aid's relief and resettlement programmes must do more than continue: they must increase. Donations are urgently needed.

INTER-CHURCH AID & REFUGEE SERVICE

(The British Council of Churches)

10 EATON GATE, LONDON, S.W.1

own evolution as persons and "it is by becoming persons that we discover the persons of our fellow men", and again: "To become a person, to discover the world of persons . . . means a complete revolution, changing the climate of our lives". As a result of such an experience Paul Tournier was led from an excess of ecclesiastical activity to a spiritual ministry. He says of a former colleague on the executive of his Church: "I had fought him tooth and nail—that is to say I had treated him as a thing, an adversary. The only thing that mattered to me was his opinions, and the weight they might convey in the balance of our arguments. . . . And

now here he was opening his heart to me. I too opened mine to him. He had come to me about his personal life and his sufferings. I was making the discovery of his person, which I had never looked for before, I was so busy combating his ideas".

Such writing as this may appear over-emotional and anti-intellectual but the author is convinced that this patient discovery of each other as persons is what is needed to keep us whole and real in the impersonal world in which we live, dominated as it is by scientific techniques.

J. L. MONGAR.

"Puritan—Yes, in a general way"

The Puritan Tradition in English Life. John Marlowe. (Cresset Press. 16s.)

The idea of this book is quite a good one, namely to trace the fortunes and influence of the movement known as "Puritanism", which originated in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. Moreover, Mr. Marlowe has a very agreeable literary style and coins some attractive epigrams. But the book is, to me at least, disappointing because with the exception of one chapter on Gladstone and Gordon it deals all the way through in generalities which are neither documented nor illustrated from primary sources, nor indeed from secondary sources either. I should confess that I am suspicious of authors who wield words ending in -ism and -ist with an easy confidence. Then this book abounds in sentences like this (the reference is to the nineteenth century): "In the up-and-coming middle class there were

obvious attractions in a religion and in a social outlook which sanctified men's ambition, justified their selfishness, and castigated the vices which they had neither the time nor the inclination to pursue". I should find this kind of remark more convincing if Mr. Marlowe had taken the trouble to quote some representative instances from the period he has in mind which are supposed to bear out what he is saying. But instead of doing this he presses on to further generalisations; such is his manner. Readers, who are sure in advance that Mr. Marlowe knows what he is talking about, will appreciate his wit and will not be constantly held up by concern about the evidence on which his assertions are based. I should not wish to discourage anyone from reading a book that is so attractively presented.

A. R. V.

Christian Heroism

Dying We Live. (The final messages and records of some Germans who defied Hitler). (Harvill. 16s.)

On the dust cover this book is called "exhilarating", and so it is. But it is in the first place a harrowing book.

Here are brought together for the first time notes and letters written by men and women under torture and sentence of death for their resistance to the Nazi régime. Contrary to the sub-title, they include the records of Dutch, Norwegian, Czech, Danish and Austrian resistance workers. Some of the contributions, those of Kim Malthe-Bruun, Petter Moen and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, have already appeared in fuller versions in this country. But this wider collection shows more fully the remarkable range of interests, ages and objectives which were represented by those who went to the gallows, rather than acquiesce in the prostitution of their national integrity.

The years which separate us from the crises in which the authors of the book acted, make it possible to read their papers with detachment as a gallant and instructive piece of history. Recent events have shown again both that the systematic exploitation of terror was not a monopoly of National Socialist doctrine, and that the problem of individual accountability in increasingly collectivist societies is acute in the "Western" democracies as well as in the peoples' "democracies". We may believe that what happened in Germany "could not happen here". Nonetheless, even in less drastic situations, qualities similar to those which shine through the contributions to this book are required.

But the book has, to my mind, a

more important point than this. It is always a difficult task for the human imagination to enter into the experience of another. But if the effort is made here, it will teach more about the meaning of the Passion than many Lent books. If we are able to go some way on what Charles Williams calls the way of substitution, with the mother who bore her child under sentence of death and then went to the gallows, or with the others in the hour of utter desolation, when even the certainty of having done the right deserted them, the experience is harrowing but the gain is great.

The main stream of the thought throughout the book sees the struggle in terms of the Christian obedience. The book does indeed contain a small but significant number of contributions from people who, initially, were not practising Christians. But the majority of these were led, by the force of their experience, into a living faith, and their writings show that this was not due merely to an attempt to come to terms with the fact of death. If one thinks of other opponents of the Nazi régime who were not practising Christians, one wonders whether a similar collection could be made of their writings.

The book has its faults, but these are largely technical: the cover is garish, the translation is sometimes uncertain, and the English edition could have done with rather more background material to set the scene. It is to be hoped that these faults will not prevent the book from being given serious and prayerful attention.

E. G. WEDELL.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Mention in this list neither implies nor precludes subsequent notice.

Marriage and the Unconscious. Edward F. Griffith. (Secker & Warburg, 21s.)
The Political Thought of John Henry, Cardinal Newman. Terence Kenny. (Longmans, 21s.)

The Human Venture. Peter A. Bertocci. (Longmans, 8s. 6d.)

The Notebooks of Florence Allshorn. (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.)

The Living of These Days. H. E. Fosdick. (S.C.M., 25s.)

The Church's Understanding of Itself. R. H. T. Thompson. (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.)

The Idea of Liberal Democracy. Nathaniel Micklem. (Christopher Johnson Ltd., 12s. 6d.)

Nature into History. Leslie Paul. (Faber., 21s.)

Citadel Market and Altar. Spencer Heath. (Science of Society Foundation, \$6.00.)

The Book of the Law. G. T. Manley. (Tyndale Press, 12s. 6d.)

Highways, Hedges and Factories. E. Moore Darling. (Longmans, 10s. 6d.)

Revolution in Missions (Symposium and Study Guide). Blaise Levai. (Popular Press, Vellore, S. India.)

He Kanonike Apopsis peri tes Epikoinonias meta ton Heterodoxon (Intercommunion).

Jerome Kotsonis. (Damaskos, Athens.)

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

***DR. LETITIA FAIRFIELD.**—Formerly Chief Medical Officer of the London County Council.

JOHN HEALEY.—Has been teaching Economics at St. John's College, Agra, and returns to India to teach Economics at Madras Christian College.

DONALD MACKINNON.—Is Professor of Moral Philosophy at Aberdeen.

DR. J. L. MONGAR.—Is a lecturer in Pharmacology at University College, London.

LESLIE PAUL.—Until recently Director of Studies at Brasted Place, now holder of "a Leverhulme Research Fellowship to write a major work of metaphysics".

REV. WILLIAM PICKERING.—Was until recently Cleave Cockerill Student at King's College, London.

ETHEL UPTON.—Is Lay Warden of the Royal Foundation of St. Katharine's, Stepney.

DR. CHARLES VEREKER.—Is a Senior Research Worker in the Department of Social Science of the University of Liverpool. His book, *The Development of Political Theory*, was published in the Hutchinson University Library in June 1957.

GOTTFRIED WEBER.—On the staff of the Evangelical Academy at Arnoldshain, near Frankfurt-on-Main.

E. G. WEDELL.—A Civil Servant in the Ministry of Education.

* Member of the Christian Frontier Council.

MOWBRAYS BOOKSHOPS



Any book reviewed or advertised in **CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER** may be obtained from Mowbrays' bookshops.

We supply books by post, and can normally despatch any book within twenty-four hours.

We keep a wide selection of Bibles and Prayer Books, general literature, and children's books, and sell and exchange Book Tokens.



A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LIMITED

28 MARGARET STREET, OXFORD CIRCUS, LONDON, W.1
35 PEMBROKE STREET, ST. ALDATE'S, OXFORD
14 KING'S PARADE, CAMBRIDGE
5 ALBION PLACE, LEEDS, 1
39 CANNON STREET, BIRMINGHAM, 2
44 BRAZENNOSE STREET, MANCHESTER, 2